DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 212 24 SP 003 903

TITLE	Culture of Schools. Final Report. Volume IV.
INSTITUTION	American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-2657
PUB DATE	[70]
CONTRACT	OEC-1-6-062657-0846
NOTE	242p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education, American Indians, *Anthropology, College Role, *Cross Cultural Studies, Disadvantaged Groups, *Educational Sociology, Minority Groups, Negroes, Primary Grades, Psychiatry, Public School Systems, *Research Needs, School Community Relationship, *School Role, Small Schools, Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The final volume of this 4-volume report contains further selections from "Anthropological Perspectives on Education," a monograph to be published by Basic Books of New York. (Other selections are in Vol. III, SP 003 902.) Monograph selections appearing in this volume are: "Great Tradition, Little Tradition, and Formal Education;" "Indians, Hillbillies, and the 'Education Problem';" "Education of the Negro Child;" "Anthropology and the Primary Grades;" "The University in the Community: Backgrounds and Perspectives on Higher Adult Education;" "The Interplay of Forces in the Development of a Small School System;" "Psychiatry and the Schools;" and "Citizenship or Certification." [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (RT)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

CULTURE OF SCHOOLS

ED039212

FINAL REPORT

VOL. IV

SP003903

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GREAT TRADITION, LITTLE TRADITION, AND FORMAL EDUCATION

Murray and Rosalie Wax

10

From a comparative and historical perspective, the vast body of research literature on schools and education appears both psuedo-empirical and psuedo-theoretical. Researchers have been administering hundreds of tests to thousands of pupils. Meantime, intellectual critics have devoted countless pages to the criticism of textbooks and other curricular materials. Yet, the bulk of their efforts contrasts markedly with its quality and its impact, because their vision has been constricted by an interlocking chain of assumptions: that schools are primarily and exclusively agencies of formal education (rather than being social institutions); that pupils are isolated individuals (rather than social beings who participate in the life of peer societies, ethnic groups, and the like); that formal education is synonomous with education; and that the principal task of the teacher is to educate. Thus, instead of inquiring what sort of social processes are occurring in -- and in relation to -- the schools, researchers and critics have defined their problem as being one of discovering how to make the schools teach their individual pupils more, better, and faster. Only a few[1] of the many researchers and critics have had the patience, fortified by the faith in ethnographic empiricism, to observe the social processes actually occurring in relation to the schools: among the pupils, among the teachers, within the classrooms, between the pupils and their parental elders, and so on.

Teachers and pupils being docile and available, it has been far easier and far more pretentiously scientific (while less threatening to the local power structure) to administer reams of tests that are then scored mechanically. As a result, the research literature lacks a solid body of data on the ethnography of schools.

. Seemingly, the theoretical literature on education would be far superior. The intellectual critics number some of the most formidably trained scholars in the country, as well as some of the most irate journalists and pontifical classicists. Unfortunately, most seem to lack that sense of history and feeling for comparison that the True Curriculum is presumed to produce. As but a small instance, consider that most of the classically trained critics laud the Hellenic system of education and, from that vantage point, denounce as trivial and unworthy of our schools such courses as Driver Training. Yet, it is surely arguable that being able to drive an automobile courteously, deftly, and responsibly, restraining aggressive impulses, and focussing attention upon the task, is a sign of good citizenship and moral excellence. A really good training in driving an automobile would merit as much approbation as the Hellenic cult of body culture. If the invidious slur on Driver Training is typical of the logic of the critics (and we take it to be so) then they are sadly deficient in the perspective and knowledge requisite for evaluating modern schools.

Asking the right questions is the path to acquiring wisdom, but to ask good questions, rather than trivial ones, the investigator has to break out of conventional frameworks. In the early part of this essay we proceed autobiographically, outlining how this happened to us so that we came to perceive freshly some of what is going on in relation to the schools. Later in the essay, we build on these experiences and elaborate a more theoretical argument which, in turn, leads to a series of research questions for the study of the culture of schools.

The School and the Little Community

We begin in traditional anthropological fashion by sketching some of what we learned about the educational problems of the Oglala Sioux on the

Pine Ridge Reservation. The patient reader will find that this is not simply an ethnographic excursion but leads to a consideration of the nature of education in a modern industrial society.

Our interest in Indian education developed during the several years in which we directed the Workshops for American Indian college students held during the summer on the campus of the University of Colorado. These workshops had been designed to provide young Indians with a broad perspective about Indian affairs, so that they could serve their communities as advisors and leaders. As we worked with these young people, we were appalled. Supposedly the cream of the Indian population, they were so provincial in the knowledge of the U.S. and so ignorant of Indian history and current affairs as to make us doubt their rank as college students. Yet, at the same time, most of them could be turned on, and to an intense glow, by lectures on Indian history, or Indian religious cults or social organization, in which we treated these phenomena as worthy of serious intellectual attention. Judging by their responses, none had ever participated in a discussion that treated Indian religious cults as vital and meaningful (rather than as superstitious, primitive, or archaic). Accordingly, we developed a critical curiosity about the nature of the educational system wherein these students had been schooled, and we deliberately decided to study an Indian population (the Pine Ridge Sioux) that had for some years been subjected to federal programs for education and assimilation.

At the time we designed the study, we envisioned the school as a battleground: on the one hand, the educators -- flanked by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the mission churches, and kindred agencies -- would be fighting to pull the children out of Indian society, while, on the other hand, the Indian

elders would be clinging desperately to their young, trying to hold them within their traditional society. Indeed, this was exactly the picture drawn for us by a high BIA official on our first day on the reservation, except that, instead of the Indian elders, he blamed "grandma," who craftily lured her grandchildren "back to the blanket."

Our hypothesis about battlegrounds was to prove as inaccurate as his about grandmas and blankets. Nevertheless, it turned out to be extremely advantageous, for it predisposed us to approach the Sioux pupils, their teachers, and the administration, as living members of social groups rather than as isolated respondents to questionnaires administered from a distance. Thus, we were obliged to sit for weeks and months in classrooms, watching what was going on and, in like manner, to talk not only to administrators and educational experts but to Indian parents and to the children themselves. In due time we realized that the educators and Indian elders were not locked in battle for the soul of the Indian child, because the Sioux elders, faced with the power of the educational establishment, simply withdrew. In this tactic they were encouraged by the educational administrators who exhorted them: just send your children to school every day and we will educate them. The educators found the absence of the parents convenient and proper, since the parents would have had no background for understanding the operations of the school and could only have interfered. Yet, here, the educators were over-confident, for within the schoolrooms they were confronting children who were alien and who could elude their ministrations. Issuing from small local communities of kith and kin, and sharing a common set of values and understandings, as well as a language (Lakota) that was unknown to most teachers, the Sioux children could and did create within

the formal structure of the educational institution, a highly cohesive society of their own. As the children matured, their society of peers became ever more solidary, and the teacher confronting them was reduced to operating at the level they would permit. While an occasional teacher might gain the approval of this peer society, most of them found themselves talking to a wall of apparent indifference and assumed incompetence. Interestingly, many teachers remarked that after the sixth or seventh grade their pupils became more "withdrawn" or "apathetic" every year, but not one realized that the wall was the outward manifestation of a subtle and highly organized rejection. The withdrawal remained a mystery to the educators.

In another respect, the design of our study differed from the more conventional ethnographic or social anthropological investigations, for we committed ourselves to a study of the Indian children in the schools. This meant that we were obliged to consider and try to understand not only Sioux society or culture, but the reservation system (teachers and administrators), and how the Indians related generally to the agencies of the greater society. This committment helped us to perceive very early that the administrators and most of the teachers looked upon the Sioux children not as members of a different or exotic culture but as members of an ethnic and inferior caste. Their task, as they saw it, was to help their pupils become members of the superior caste.

The status of the Sioux as being lower caste was so conspicuously visible among the educators that we singled out one of its manifestations for analysis under the label of "The Vacuum Ideology." The reference is to the experiential background of the Sioux child, for the educators, especially the administrators, did not regard this child as participating in a distinctive culture and society but, instead, as lacking in those preschool

experiences which distinguish the desirable kind of pupil. Judging by the experiences that were listed, the ideal pupil would have been of urban middle-class, Protestant (and White) background, and, insofar as the Sioux pupil lacked those particular experiences, it was not that he had had others but that he was deficient. Since his parents had not read Peter Rabbit to him, he lacked familiarity with stories; and since they did not sing Anglo-Saxon lullabies to him, he lacked familiarity with music. The same ideology is also prevalent among educators confronting children of urban lower-class and ethnic backgrounds. . .

Subsequent experience has convinced us that many educators are passionately attached to the notion that their disprivileged or poor pupils come to them with empty minds which must be filled before they can compete with youngsters from "the usual middle-class home." Nevertheless, they withdraw in horror from the suggestion that a denial of experience constitutes a denial of socialization or human development. That a little child might not respond warmly to a teacher who sees him and his folks as empty vessels does not occur to them.

Almost in spite of ourselves, we have been led to the conclusion that some of our most important general educational goals constitute ruthless attacks on the solidarity and self-respect of the ethnic and lower-class communities, and, indeed, on their very existence. The Vacuum Ideology is only one of the more recent tactical offenses. Another is the goal of individualistic achievement.

The modern school system is premised on the notion that its population is an aggregate of social atoms, among whom there are no significant or permanent linkages. In the ideology of the educators, these social atoms

begin at the same starting line and then move onward in haphazard clumps, each atom achieving independently of the others and according to its own inner strengths and motives. What an individual does in school, and later, in his vocation, is an achievement -- his individual achievement -- deriving from his own initiative and effort, and of benefit only to himself and his immediate family. Contrary to this ideology is the normative system of a folk community which confronts an alien society. For in this system the individual may excel only when his excellence enhances the position of his brethren. If this achievement were to derogate them before others, then it would be incumbent on him to conceal his talents. Thus, in the schools on Pine Ridge, our staff observed classrooms where, when the teacher called upon a pupil to recite he would become the target for jibes and jokes, whispered in Lakota and unperceived by the teacher, with the result that he would stand or sit paralyzed and unable to respond; meanwhile, the teacher, being oblivious to the secret life of the classroom, would be perplexed and distressed at her inability to secure responses indicating that she had covered the day's lesson. In like manner, there are the observations of Harry Wolcott who, for his doctoral dissertation taught in a one-room school among Indians on an island off the Northwest Coast. Wolcott reports that, although he taught for a full year, living among the community, he was never able to learn just how much or how little most of his pupils knew, because, no matter what the nature of the classwork -- whether test or seatwork or whathaveyou -- no one could be induced to work solely for himself.

The fact that the educators themselves seem unaware that individualistic achievement as they define it is considered grossly immoral behavior by the children they are trying to instruct is an obvious case of selective inattention. But the fact that social researchers are so often indifferent

to this type of conflict and to its implications is more surprising and puzzling. This brings us to the second part of this paper: a consideration of the inadequacy of past and current research on schools and education.

Psuedo-Empirical Research on Education

Because of the fundamental orientation of their research, most investigators have managed to avoid looking at what actually occurs within schools. Since they collect much data, their research appears to be empirical, but in actuality they have been selectively inattentive to important classes of phenomena. Educational psychologists, for example, convert the society of pupils into an aggregate of individual animals, each of whom must be trained to perform certain tasks established by the curriculum. Discovering what the pupils are actually engaged in doing and experiencing is irrelevant to the job which the psychologist has defined for himself, namely structuring the school situation so that each of the human animals is made to learn more and to learn faster. The educational psychologist thus comes to function like the industrial psychologist whose role it is to help increase production. For both, the fundamental tasks are established by the bureaucratically given structure, and the researcher accepts as his goal the devising of ways to accomplish those tasks most expeditiously. Whatever else may be going on within the school, or however else the child may be being educated, becomes relevant for the researcher only insofar as it clearly affects the performance of the curricularly given tasks.

In like manner, structural-functionalists among sociologists have tended to orient themselves by defining their discipline as "the sociology of education" and by assuming that the school is that institution having education as its primary function. In effect, these plausible assumptions

serve to transform the scientific problem of the nature of the school (and its relationship to other social activities) into the problem of evaluating the school in terms of the extent to which it performs a particular educational function (Cf Brotz, 1961). If further, the sociologist relies principally upon survey procedures, with rigid schedules administered to large numbers of pupils, then he has thoroughly inhibited himself from the observation of the school as a species of social organization. The pupils are perceived as social atoms, differing from each other in terms of their ethnic-religious and social-class backgrounds, but the school is rarely studied as a society or social system which is more than an arena for the movement of these atoms.

Lest we be misunderstood, we should like to emphasize that the issue is not the learning theory of some psychologists nor the structural-functionalism of some sociologists. Either theory and discipline could be utlized in the empirical study of schools, but in fact they seldom have been, and the research which is done has a flavor that is tragi-comic. For example, investigators known to us are now engaged in elaborate investigations involving, on the one hand, the administration of large batteries of tests to hundreds of Indian and White pupils, and, on the other hand, the observation in detail of the relationships between Indian mothers and their children. The hypothesis informing the research is that the progressive "withdrawal" characteristic of Indian pupils in schools is the outcome of a psychic inadequacy related to their upbringing. Were these investigators to perform some elementary ethnography, inquiring as to how the Indians perceive their community situation and the role of the schools, and if they were then to observe classroom interactions, their comprehension of what they presume to be a psychic inadequacy might be thoroughly trans-

formed. But for this to occur, they would have to be prepared to examine the school as a real institution affecting a real inter-ethnic community of Indians and Whites, instead of reducing the school to an educational function and dissolving the Sioux child out of his community and his lower-caste situation.

On the other hand, research conducted along Community Study lines has often contributed a great deal to the understanding of the schools (whether or not the research has utilized a structural-functionalist or learning theory conceptualization). The major endeavors (Hollingshead, Havighurst, Wylie, etc.) which have had the school as the focus of the community study are well recognized, but it is important to note that almost any thorough study of a geographic community can contribute to our knowledge of the schools. In Whyte's study of Cornerville, it is necessary to read between the lines to learn about the schools, but in Gans' later study of an ethnically similar community, much can be gained from the brief pages on the topic (1965:129-136). Similar value can be found in the pages relating to the schools in the studies by Withers (1945), Vidich and Bensman (1960), the Lynds, Hughes (1963), Warner and associates (1949), et al. Indeed, the fact that these studies are not focussed on the schools has a certain advantage, for the educationally focussed studies allow their research to be oriented overly much by the ideology of the schools, and so they spend too many pages in demonstrating that the schools do not provide equal opportunity for achievement and too few pages to describing what the schools actually are doing.

In contrast to these contemporaneous varieties of social research on education is a study so old as to be dated, having been published over thirty years ago. Yet this study, which, to our knowledge, has had no

successor, is the only one which comes close to describing the school as an institution. We have in mind Waller's The Sociology of Teaching. His research procedures appear to have been informal, and he seems to have relied mainly upon his own experiences and the reports and diaries of teachers who were students of his, yet, nonetheless, he systematically reviewed the major sorts of interactions associated with being a teacher. As compared with the several, methodologically-sophisticated readers in the sociology of education now on the market, his is the only book that discusses such significant topics as elementary forms of collective behavior within the classroom or the role of ceremonies in the life of the school. In a sense, Waller viewed the school as a community, and its educators and pupils as social beings participating in the life of the community, and so he produced a monograph that can serve to suggest directions for research on contemporary schools. Stimulated by his book, we would like here to advance several questions for research on the schools: What kinds of social roles emerge within the schools, among the teachers, the pupils, and the lay public associated with the schools? What social forms emerge within the context of the schools? Are there typical cycles of reform associated with the school system, similar, perhaps, to the reforming movements within the Catholic Church, of which some culminated in the founding of religious orders and others in the rise of new sects? What happens to children within the schools -- how are children transformed into pupils?

A knowledgable and shrewd anthropologist can advance a number of hypotheses in response to the questions we have just raised. He could, for instance, point to the differences between the kind of age-grading that occurs among the children of hunting peoples who roam in small bands and that which occurs within our public schools, where children are associated

with a narrow stratum of others of almost exactly the same calendrical age. From there he could argue about the differences that would develop because the first kind of children would have the opportunity to associate with others much older than themselves and would have also the association with and responsibility for other children much younger than themselves; and, continuing the train of logic, he could argue as to the kinds of differences in personality that might ensue. Yet, much as we welcome such broad speculation, we do wish to insist that there is much about our schools that we don't know for sure because investigators have not been looking -- they have administered tens of thousands of tests and conducted hundreds of interviews, but only a handful have looked systematically and diligently and sympathetically at all phases of the school in relationship to pupils, educators, and parents.

Just as we need to know more about how children are transformed into pupils, so we need to know more about how young persons (usually college students) are transformed into teachers. The research here has been limited and is mostly represented by that variety in which tests or other fixed schedules of questions are administered to samples of teacher trainees and veteran teachers (cf. Guba, Jackson, and Bidwell in Charters and Gage 1963: 271-286). In accounting for the attitudes and conduct of veteran teachers, most critics have stressed the relationship between the teacher and the school administration, the latter usually being bureaucratic, conservative, and timorous. However, we would also be inclined to suggest a Goffmanical posture of inquiry that would inquire as to the effects upon a person of having to be on public display before -- and in constant disciplinary control of -- a large audience of alien children for many hours per day. It is not, we would guess, the school administration per se that develops

the teacher type, but the administrative requirement of facing and controlling so large a body of youngsters. We are impressed by the fact that the problem of maintaining discipline in the classroom is foremost among the anxieties of the novice teacher, and also foremost among the demands made upon the teacher by his supervisors, and yet the literature of social research on the issue is so weak and so focussed on individual children as "disciplinary problems." We are also impressed by the fact that most novices do manage to maintain discipline in their classes, and that critical attention is usually directed only to the conspicuous failures of discipline, but that few scholars ask how the stunt is turned. Yet the question of how discipline is maintained throughout a school is, we suggest, a paradigm for the question of how order is maintained in civil society.

The School and the Great Tradition

To propose the foregoing questions -- how do children become pupils? how do young people become teachers? how is discipline maintained within the schoolroom? -- is to declare that the cross-cultural comparisons that anthropologists have conventionally attempted are limited in their relevance to formal education. By comparing the experiences of the contemporary schoolchild in the Bronx with that of a juvenile in New Guinea thirty years ago, we can say something significant about the personality development of the child, but we are in limbo so far as concerns much that is significant about formal education. As much is evident in terms of the content of the readers and textbooks on anthropology and education produced but a generation ago. The authors are well qualified, their essays are frequently of intrinsic interest, but their pertinence to the contemporary educational drama is negligible. For these anthropologists, trying to be

culturally relativistic, defined "educational practices" in broad terms. Viewing cultures as separate and distinct entities that could be compared as independent individuals, they conceived of each as having its own system of child-rearing and, therefore, of education. Such a procedure did have and still has some uses, but it cannot hope to characterize the contemporary situation where education is of the order of an international mission activity, being exported from the U. S. and other Western societies. Education in this sense is avowedly intended to decrease the isolation of other ("backward") societies and to alter drastically their cultural configurations, and in its aggressive impact, this education is similar to the spread of Christianity, Islam, Communism, or capitalistic business practices.

Indeed, the traditional anthropological procedure was not even accurate for the history of Western society or of other civilized societies. For the Western system of formal education is rooted in its Great Tradition (Redfield, 1956: chap. 3; Singer, 1960) and can only be understood on that basis. Great Traditions, it will be recalled, are borne by a literate corps of disciples, and they are in tension with the Little Traditions transmitted informally within the little community. Or, in the pithy language of Bharati (1963):

> what the missionary in a particular religion wants the less knowledgable votaries to do, defines the "big tradition," and what he wants them to give up and to desist from in the future, defines the "little tradition" in [illegible] religious area.

Christianity has epitomized that tension, for on the one hand, there have been its dedicated disciples, oriented toward the millenial creed of its scriptures, while, on the other hand, there have been the folk, who have required a religion which, through its values and symbols, expressed the unity and morality of the little community. The tension has been clearly

visible in the U. S. churches, especially of the contemporary South: for, as its dedicated ministers affirm, the Christian message would require thorough desegregation, since all men are brothers in Christ; yet, to the members of the local White community, the local church embodies their moral unity and necessarily excludes the Negroes as alien and profane. The school stands in a similar situation, for, on the one hand, it too, is a kind of local church, embodying the sacred values of the little community. Yet, on the other hand, the school is connected, organizationally and ideationally, with the greater society and with the Great Traditions of the West.

In their relationship to the contemporary and actual school systems, intellectual critics -- such as ourselves -- play somewhat the role of the fervent religious orders within the medieval church. The critics are painfully conscious of the true message; they are prepared to be tolerant of some of the little traditional beliefs, providing they can be incorporated within the body of dogma; but they are appalled at the heresy and corruption within the institutional church. They debate theories of education with their fellows, as if these were theological creeds, and they are perturbed that the school as a reality bears so little a resemblance to the school as the gateway to salvation.

If we may be permitted to continue this metaphor, we would suggest that what social scientists, especially anthropologists, could now accomplish in their research upon education is a purification of the dogma. The world of today is in the midst of a vast expansion and elaboration of the system of formal education: more peoples are sending their children to school; and, once in school, more children are spending longer periods of their lives. This transformation is of such magnitude and abruptness as to deserve the label of <u>revolution</u>, and it appears quite comparable in scope to movements,

such as the spread of Christianity in the ancient world, or to the Industial Revolution. While both of these did become worldwide, in order to do so each has had to purify itself of much ideological dross. Christianity did not become really effective in northern Europe until its populace had eliminated from the dogma many of the peculiarities distinctive to the Mediterranean world and reformulated it in terms of their own ethnic traditions. The Industrial Revolution did not begin to permeate many areas of the world, until its dogma of Manchester Liberalism was dismembered and replaced by local or nativistic creeds disguising themselves behind the flexible vocabularies of nationalism and socialism. Now, we should like to suggest that our U. S. educational system is similarly loaded with ideological irrelevancies that make it unsuited to other countries (cf. Thomas, 1966:72-74) and have made it clearly unsuited to our own ethnic and lower-class populations. We would hazard that the unsuitability in other countries is, at present disguised by the outpourings of financial and moral assistance from the West coupled with the native willingness to accept our institutional complexes in the dizzy hope of becoming as prosperous and powerful as the U. S. In about a decade, the twin impetus should have given out, and anthropologists may be in a position to observe some interesting attempts to reshape the educational structure. More than this, it should be possible for anthropologists to be of marked assistance in the reshaping and purification of education, providing that they are astute, critical, begin their work in the near future, and discard the restrictive blinders of irrelevant or system-biased research as we noted earlier.

Let us give an example of an ideological tenet that, as we have indicated, hampers the adjustment of some peoples to the Western system of formal education. U. S. and Western schools, generally, have been organized

about the notion of individual achievement with the reward of personal advancement and benefit. Looking historically and comparatively, we believe it can be argued that this tenet may not be essential and may even be somewhat of a hindrance, unless suitably modified. Great Traditions, generally, and Western scholarship, specifically, have been borne by associations of disciples, who have shared common goals and been subject to a common discipline. Anthropologists (or other social-scientists) would not accomplish what they do, wrestling with the hardships they must face, unless sustained by their association of compeers. There is individualistic competition, and it does stimulate to achievement, but it is a competition that is regulated by formal norms against deceit and plagarism and by informal norms of courtesy, fellowship, and comradehood. Whenever previously, the attempt has been made to disseminate widely Great Traditional knowledge throughout a population, it has been associated with a social movement having superpersonal goals. The Jews were among the first to accomplish widespread literacy, and it was strictly in a religious context, in order to bring about the salvation of Israel and the participation of the individual in that joyous event. With Protestantism a similar movement for literacy developed, more individualistic perhaps, but nonetheless set in the context of a social movement and communal aspirations. Today, in the U. S., we seem to be pushing the notion of individualistic competition within the framework of the school to an almost superhuman pitch. Yet, it is striking that real progress toward spreading literacy among lower-class or ethnic groups has so often occurred in the context of social movements: civil rights, the Black Muslims, and, as always, the evangelistic churches.

Another example of an ideological tenet THAT has hampered the adjustment of some peoples to the system of formal education is, we believe, the

notion that each child must be identified with a unique nuclear family and that the community encompassing the school is a community of nuclear families. As anthropologists, we are bound to ask whether as efficient an educational establishment could be fitted into a society with extended families and elaborate systems of kinship? Speaking from our observations among the Sioux (and our readings about other peoples, or even about the Hutterites and Amish), this is no idle question. So much of the procedures of the systems of schooling and welfare and public health are geared to the assumption that each child must be part of an intact nuclear family or else he is a neglected child, and the power of the state and the wealth of its agencies is thereby used to disrupt the extended family and cement the nuclear. In the case of the American Indian, it is not yet too late to ask whether we should be doing this, and we may also bear in mind that many more peoples of the world and and will be increasingly involved with this issue.

The School and the Little Tradition

Because researchers have focussed on curricularly given tasks (cf. section 2 above) and critics have focussed on Great Traditional knowledge, no one has been looking systematically at the impact of formal educational institutions on little traditional processes of child rearing. Instead, there has been recourse to the concept of "cultural deprivation," which (like the Vacuum Ideology of Sioux educators) has enabled the theorists and administrators to ignore the culture of the impoverished and ethnic peoples, on the ground that it either scarcely exists or exists in such distorted form as best to be suppressed. Some social-scientists have been arguing as if these peoples are lacking -- linguistically, psychically, and culturally (Roach, 1965 and the retort by Hughes). Surely, here it is necessary to be concrete

and ethnographic and to ask in specific detail about the experiences of the child in various contexts. Continuing our usage of the Great/Little Traditional dichotomy and tension, we would suggest that the process of formal schooling is, to a large degree, the struggle to substitute one kind of tradition (or knowledge) for another within the mind of the child. Where, in a folk society, the child would have to master a great variety of particular bits of knowledge, concerning particular persons, topographic features, rites, skills, and so on, the archetypical urban school is oriented toward instilling a knowledge that is abstract, general, and in some sense, "rational," and, thereby, deracinated. In like manner, where in a folk society there is a great stress on the function of language to promote consensus and maintain the integrity of the community (Wright), in the urban middle-class world and its schools the stress is on language as a vehicle for imparting "rational" knowledge to strangers. Within the hierarchy of schools, it is the elite university with its graduate education that has epitomized this type of knowledge and language dialect, but the demand now is being made that the elementary school system participate even more intimately in this effort.

But knowledge or tradition does not exist in a vacuum; it is borne by individual human beings, and the demand that is being made on the schools to rationalize their curricula even further is, also, a demand that they produce a certain variety of human being -- abstract, theoretical, rational, and, hence, deracinated -- the academic man writ large. But we are sufficiently disenchanted with our colleagues, and with the middle class of the U. S., to ask that researchers and critics examine the issue. In making the school more efficient in its transmission of formal knowledge, to what extent will the reformers be helping to create human beings who are more

thoroughly deracinated and dehumanized? Conversely, to what extent are the current, so-called "inefficiencies" and stupidities of the school system really a blessing or a source of hope, because it is in these interstices (and irrationalities) that the child still has some chance of developing as a human being? We can, here, even ask about the Little Traditions of the school, the lore and experience that is transmitted informally among pupils, between teacher and pupils (and vice versa), within the school system. How much of what it means to be a man does a boy learn from his schoolmates (rather than from the curricular content of the school)? As reforms eat away at irrationalities and inefficiencies of the school, will they likewise reduce even further the opportunity to observe and experience the meaning of manliness? The skeptical reader may counter that we are here indulging in ethnographic nostalgia, and to be frank we are recalling the youthful Sioux, and their fine personal sensibility, the brilliance of their singing, the virility of their dancing, their exuberant vitality. Last summer, we were examining Head Start programs operated for Indian children, and we vividly recall one occasion in which we stepped from a powwow, that was distinguished by the most exciting singing and dancing, into a classroom where some well-meaning teacher was leading children through the familiar, dreary, off-tune rendition of a nursery song. Later, members of this staff were to talk with us about what they were doing for these "culturally deprived" children.

As we look at the youth of the contemporary U. S., we are not impressed by the success of our system of education and training. So many of our young men can perform well on the national tests of achievement and yet they lack the pride and self-confidence in their manliness. We recognize full well that to an audience of anthropologists and intellectuals, these

criticisms may seem overly familiar. Yet, we think someone has to raise these questions, as research questions, and we think that this is part of our task as intellectuals and anthropologists, because otherwise all of us tend to concentrate so exclusively on the issue of educational tasks -- how the schools can teach better, faster, and more: how can kids be taught Russian at three, calculus at four, and nuclear physics at five -- and neglect to ask a far more important question: what is happening to our children as human beings?

Let us summarize by using an economic model. Theoretically, it would be possible to isolate children in an environment free of all stimulation. Such environments, we would surmise, are pretty rare and would exist only in the most misguided and understaffed institutions. Given an actual environment, whether it be Harlem, Pine Ridge, or Summerfield, children will be experiencing and learning. If they are part of a folk society, they will be learning a folk culture. If they are part of the general U. S. middle-class, they will be learning its culture, and, if this latter, they will be better fitted for early achievement in school. For example, the child reared among the middle-class may acquire a larger vocabulary than the child reared in the slum or the reservation. Yet, while the size of vocabulary is predictive of early scholastic achievement, it is not a statement of linguistic or social maturity; for, as but one illustration, consider that some people of a modest vocabulary can be far more eloquent than scholars whose vocabulary is huge. What the child experiences in home and school is but a selection from a vast possible range, so that, in economic terms, if the child is having one kind of experience, then he cannot be having another. If he is learning calculus, then he is not simultaneously learning to dance, powwow style. We are suggesting that most

intellectuals, including anthropologists, are so sold on the value of children learning calculus, that they have forgotten about the value of dancing, and that they are made so irate by the diction of incompetent educators who prate about the value of learning to play <u>with</u> others, that they have forgotten the intimate relationship between play and freedom.

23 690

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, Robert R.
1962 The sociology of education: a sourcebook. Nomewood, Ill., Dorsey Press.

Bharati, A.
1963 Eclectic patterns in Indian pilgrimage. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco. Dittoed.

Brotz, Howard
1961 Functionalism and dynamic analysis. European Journal of Sociology (Archives Européenes de Sociologie) 2:170-179.

Charters, W. W., Jr. and N. L. Gage
1963 Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston, Allyn & Bacon.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z.
1965 Coming of age in America: growth and acquiesence. New York, Random House.

Gans, Herbert J.
1965 The urban villagers: group and class in the life of Italian-Americans. New York, Free Press.

Goffman, Erving
1959 The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, Doubleday Ancho

Guba, Egon G., Philip W. Jackson, and Charles E. Bidwell
1963 Occupational choice and the teaching career in Readings in the social psychology of education. W. W. Charters and N. L. Gage, eds., pp. 271-286. Reprinted, Educational Research Bulletin (1959) 38:1-12, 27.

Halsey, A. H., Jean Floud, and C. Arnold Anderson
1961 Education, economy, and society. New York, Free Press.

Havighurst, Robert J. et al.
1962 Growing up in River City. New York, John Wiley.

Henry, Jules
1963 Culture against man. New York, Random House.

Hollingshead, A. B.
1949 Elmtown's youth. New York, John Wiley.

Hughes, Everett Cherrington
1963 French Canada in transition. Chicago, University of Chicago, Phoenix Books, p. 139.

Hughes, Everett Cherrington
1965 Comment on "Sociological analysis and poverty" by J. L. Roach. American Journal of Sociology 71:75-76.

Redfield, Robert
1956 Peasant society and culture. Chicago, Phoenix Books (P 53), University of Chicago Press.

Roach, Jack L.
1965 Sociological analysis and poverty. American Journal of Sociology 71:68-75, 76-77.

Singer, Milton
1960 The great tradition of Hinduism in the city of Madras. In Anthropology of folk religions, Charles Leslie, ed. New York, Vintage Books (V 105), Random House. (Reprinted from Journal of American Folklore 71:347-388.)

Spindler, George D.
1963 Education and culture: anthropological approaches. New York, Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Thomas, Elizabeth Marshall
1966 Warrior herdsmen. London, Secker & Warburg.

Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Bensman
1960 Small town in mass society. New York, Doubleday Anchor.

_____, _____, and Maurice R. Stein
1964 Reflections on community studies. New York, John Wiley.

Waller, Willard
1965 The sociology of teaching. New York, John Wiley, Science Editions.

Warner, William Lloyd
1949 Democracy in Jonesville: a study of quality and inequality. New York, Harper & Bros.

Withers, Carol
1945 Plainville by James West (pseud.). New York, Columbia University.

Wolcott, Harry F.
1965 A Kwakiutl village and its school: cultural barriers to classroom performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Stanford University.

Wright, Rolland
The urban man.

Wylie, Laurence
1964 Village in the Vauclose. New York, Harper & Row, Colophon Books CN 24.

25 692

NOTES

1. Since we do not have occasion later in our text to refer to some of the outstanding studies of contemporary schools, we would like here to note that Jules Henry (1963) and a number of researchers affiliated with the Bank Street College of Education -- notably, Donald Horton, Zachary Gussow, and Eleanor Leacock -- have been excellent and diligent observers of the school system. We should mention, as well, Edgar Z. Friedenberg (1965), who uses questionnaire schedules to rationalize his studies and essays, but whose shrewd observations of contemporary schools burst through his attempts to perform a mechanical analysis of his formal data.

2. After reading this essay in manuscript, Howard S. Becker commented that we "may have understated a little the difficulty of observing contemporary classrooms. It is not just the survey method of educational testing or any of those things that keeps people from seeeing what is going on. I think, instead. that it is first and foremost a matter of it all being so familiar that it becomes almost impossible to single out events that occure in the classroom as things that have occurred, even when they happen right in front of you. I have not had the experience of observing in elementary and high school classrooms myself, but I have in college classrooms and it takes a tremendous effort of will and imagination to stop seeing only the things that are conventionally 'there' to be seen. I have talked to a couple of teams of research people who have sat around in classrooms trying to observe and it is like pulling teeth to get them to see or write anything beyond what 'everyone' knows."

INDIANS, HILLBILLIES, AND THE "EDUCATION PROBLEM"

Robert K. Thomas
and

Albert L. Wahrhaftig

Carnegie Cross-Cultural
Education Project
Box 473,
Tahlequah, Okla.

October, 1966

Introduction

As anthropologists, our talents are best realized when we can deal with the institutions of human societies as expressions of viable communities of people dealing with their environment. It is not with the exotic aspects of "culture" that we are concerned so much as with the processes of human viability. We are bound to see education as part of the general human process of socialization whereby young people are prepared to fit successfully into the internal environment of the community of their upbringing and into the external environment within which exists the total community of human beings of which they are a part. Schools, where they exist, we treat as a specialized institutional arrangement designed to accomplish some specified part of the educational process which relates individual humans to their communally understood environment.

Although anthropologists have sympathetically dealt with the intricate and alien education given to the young of many distant societies, we still generally deal with such communities as a closed system -- e. g. with a single African tribe, heuristically isolated. It is for this reason that so little anthropological knowledge has been transferable to the educational problems encountered by communities of people in the United States and by those who educate them. By virtue of this methodology, we are seldom equipped to do more than consult on the degree of fit between given educational institutions and people of a given culture. To the extent that we become able to comprehend our total national society as the context wherein the life of small communities is enacted, we find that it is not the nature of the communities encountered within it that causes us to pause. We find that Yaqui Indians are Yaqui Indians, whether they live in ~~communities in Puerto Rico~~

communities in Tucson Arizona or Potam Mexico, and Kickapoo Indians are Kickapoo Indians whether their communities are in Jones Oklahoma or Nacimiento Mexico. Rather, the nation-as-environment presents us with new factors to consider. We are accustomed to dealing with communities where only famine, disaase, or, perhaps, conquest constitute serious threats to communal viability. Now, when we turn our attention homeward, we must suddenly add to this list of environmental variables those threats to survival posed not just by urban civilization with its universal tendency towards dehumanization and alientation, but also by the centralization and stratification of power and technology in our own national variant of urban society.

For the many tribal and folk-like communities in our country now, our national expectation of social mobility, and our imposition of education as an instrument of mobility, are cardinal facts of the total environment. These are conditions for viability demanded of such communities by the increasing number of highly urbanized people who, as a corporate elite, guide our national destiny on the assumption that as individuals, through education, we all learn to become successful participants in a national social system.

Within this environment, as within any other, we are only able to know how much and in what ways individual human beings learn by seeing how and with what success whole communities of human beings function in context. Only from this can we determine the effectiveness of the educational process. Anthropological research on schools and education is meaningful under these circumstances only to the extent that it is an aspect of research on the small community "in process". Research on the small community in process of dealing with a national environment is reflexive; if our studies teach us nothing about our national social system, then we are learning nothing about

the community, its educational processes, or its scholastic problems. It is the process of coming to terms with an environment that is causal of human action, and it is defects in this process which are causal of human problems.

Indians, Folk Whites, and "The System"

Our own knowledge of Indians, folk-whites, and their schools has been gained in the Ozark area of Eastern Oklahoma. Within this area, we find all the ingredients of the American "educational problem" as well as most of the latest gimmicks devised to solve it.

Before 1907, this entire area was part of the Cherokee Nation. Twelve thousand Cherokee Indians live within it now, 9,500 of them in traditionally-structured small Cherokee-speaking settlements. The educational level of these Cherokee Indians is one of the lowest in the United States and their drop-out rate one of the highest. Forty percent of adult Cherokees are functionally illiterate in English. Roughly one in three heads of Cherokee households in country Cherokee settlements cannot speak English. Cherokees attended their own schools for half a century and the school system of the State of Oklahoma for sixty years thereafter. Even so, the Cherokee community of eastern Oklahoma is one of the least educated in our nation.

Interspersed among the Cherokees are rural communities of what we shall call "folk Anglo-Saxons". Elsewhere in the United States these people might be called "hillbillies" or "Okies", but the terms are perjorative and do not match the local self-image. Most of these white families moved into the Cherokee Nation either as "intermarried whites" or as illegal intruders during the 1890's. They were the restless, rootless seekers after opportunity who moved west from Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Some have "made good" as the backbone of

the local small town middle class. Most are "just country folk", "respectable people" in their own eyes, but as culturally distinct from the Oklahoma middle class as they are from Cherokee Indians. While their level of education is low and their drop-out rate is high, they are slightly better educated than their Cherokee neighbors.

Folk Anglo-Saxons are very poor, and Cherokees are poorer still. Both populations work predominantly at unskilled jobs. Among both populations unemployment rates are astronomical. In short, both populations rank among the peoples Americans feel privileged to call "under-privileged". Only recently have the poverty and lack of education of these people been officially recognized, but already intense efforts are being made to help them to (in the current idiom) "participate in the mainstream of American life."

Such solutions to the problems of these folk as are being put into practice reflect great faith in education as a palliative. In addition to renewed state concern with school consolidation and administrative reform, new federal programs are being introduced: Project Head Start, an attempt to imprint underprivileged children with the school mother-image; Neighborhood Youth Corps, which offers cash and the promise of a student consumption level equal to the more privileged student body as an inducement to continuing education; and, to be implemented in the near future, Upward Bound for the survivors of high school. At the same time, other new vocabulary and another new complex of programs indicate that local planners see a relationship between non-participation and cultural differences. The former Cherokee Nation is coming to be identified as a part of a newly-discovered culture area, "Ozarkia", for which a special web of legislation is being woven. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been

entrusted with setting up new adult education courses within Indian communities. The leading educational establishment within the state, the University of Oklahoma, has joined with socially conscious state politicians to form a powerful new organization, Oklahomans for Indian Opportunity (OIO). The OIO program depends heavily on creating a better fit between Indian communities and local school systems by inviting selected members of Indian communities to attend "leadership training seminars" at the University, and by establishing "human relations centers" in Indian communities to promote programs of educational encouragement. Taken together, such programs reflect a pervasive concern with fitting people as individuals (and perhaps even as communities) into a school system. There are even some indications, such as a proposal by the OIO to teach educators and school administrators more about Indians, that in some instances the school system may be altered to fit people and their communities.

In eastern Oklahoma, we see the stereotype of the "education problem" in the United States: a "problem" population low in income, education, and social rank dealt with by an administrative elite attempting to solve problems by acquiring power and money with which to amplify and strengthen educational and social institutions.

We maintain that the problem is <u>not</u> in the fit of people to their schools and institutions, as has been suggested by so many modern academic critics of the American school system. It is true that if a community is facing a stable environment and simply wants to maintain its life style, there will of course be a perfect fit between school and community. However if a community facing a rapidly changing environment responds by wishing to train its children to live in a different and more advantageous way,

then members of the community will deliberately create or utilize an educational system which does not fit themselves or their children. This was the case with immigrant communities in American cities in the 1900's, with Cherokee Indians who entered mission schools in the early 1800's, and possibly is true of some West African peoples today. Modern critics are convinned that the fit between school and community is a problem because so often they observe schools that do not "belong" to the communities they serve. It is the experience of the student for whom school is a daily symbolic reminder that he is an unwelcome alien in a foreign province that makes the question of "fit" seem important, It is not the fact that he does not fit the school that damages a student; it is the expectation that any "normal" student ought to fit, or be made to fit. So, the problem lies in who does the fitting and why.

The Ozark area of Oklahoma is of interest not so much because of the peculiar ethnicity of its population, but because it is an area involved in catching up with a "culture lag". The social change which in more urbanized parts of the United States took place steadily since the early 1930"s is taking place in the isolated

Ozarks now, at a more accellerated pace. In eastern Oklahoma we are able to see recapitulated the history of small communities and their school systems throughout the United States as they were affected by the increased urbanization and centralization of power which betokens participation in the modern American social system. As the social system of this area has developed and become more akin to modern middle class America, both the Cherokee and the folk Anglo-Saxons have become casualties -- educationally and socially.

Increasingly, eastern Oklahoma is coming to be an integral part of the American social system; increasingly Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons are out of it. No matter how greatly Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons differ in the ethnographic particular, it is their common role as "out of it" communities in the midst of an evolving and ceaselessly closing social system that is definitive of their problems. The relationship of these communities to the educational system which now confronts them -- their position vis-a-vis the schools which now serve as intermediary between individuals and "the system" -- tell us explicitly how the United States is put together.

Administrators, educators, and a whole school of social scientists see such communities as aggregates of underprivileged individuals. Lacking, it seems, the ability to perceive a functioning community in the first place, they perceive the problems of such communities as caused by an unsatisfactory relationship between individuals and "Society". Given this perception of causality, a solution based on giving more power to institutions (such as schools) on the assumption that deprived individuals can be encouraged to participate in them follows logically enough. In this paper, we assert that this very set of perceptions, assumptions, and power relationships is the cause of the problem. When scholars and administrators can gather in Denver, Colorado to discuss

the "Indian problem" in eastern Oklahoma, that is an Indian problem. Human beings exist within systems of human relationships. Human communities exist within the broader reaches of these same systems of relationships. Their problems, as communities of people, are caused by the relationship of community and social system.

It takes no great sociological insight to see that this is the case. Even a very brief historical sketch of the relationship between Cherokees and their schools demonstrates that when the Cherokees as an on-going people realized that they needed education in order to deal with the conditions that confronted them, they gradually developed for themselves a means of education which, of course, being of the community fit the community. Whenever the relationship of Cherokees to their environment was disrupted and traumatic events left the Cherokees incapacitated, their school system, in the absence of conditions which demonstrated its utility, then suffered precisely the problems (lack of fit and alienation from community) which now beset it and other contemporary American school systems./

Cherokees

~~Cherokees~~ and their schools

Throughout the entirety of their known history, the Cherokees have been a populous, classically "tribal", conservative, but astoundingly pragmatic people. In the past four hundred years, the Cherokees have faced a continual procession of dramatic, complex and traumatic occurrences. As a tribe, they weathered these, and learned. They were never smashed to the earth and disintegrated, as were many tribes. When, like the mink, their foot was caught in a trap, they gnawed it off; when for their protection they needed sons with the knowledge and cunning of white men, they "farmed out" their own sons and let them scout the destiny of the tribe; and when these sons worked against their fathers and brothers, they cut them adrift, drawing the ranks of the tribe close against their influence

and leaving the cast offs to marry whites and become a part of the society that had so turned their heads.

The modern Cherokee community participates in a way of life that has been consistent in form and direction since before the coming of white men. In the 1700's, Cherokees lived in small settlements, each consisting of a single group of kinsmen, clustered around larger "mother towns". Periodically, kinsmen from smaller settlements joined with relatives in the mother towns to enact together the sacred ceremonial events which assure the whole people of a healthy, prosperous and satisfying existence. These meetings of the people at their seven major ceremonies were periods of mutual deliberation. Life in a household is no more rewarding than a mother-in-law will allow it to be, and no mother-in-law is satisfied with witless, routinized, propitiation. A sensible man takes his mother-in-law problem to his father, wherein the shade of a tree an old man can be listened to and even argued with. So it is with a people. Even in times of peace and security, it takes the resources of all to adjust the intricate mechanisms of a shared life. Four hundred years later, transported by death march from the Southeast over a "Trail of Tears" to Oklahoma and surrounded by a nation of intruders, this is the consistency of Cherokee life. In eastern Oklahoma, small groups of Cherokee kinsmen live in nearly sixty settlements. The aboriginal village council of "beloved men" has shed its formality and sharp delineation. Instead, after dark and every Sunday, the yards of "white headed" men are crowded with the cars of neighbors bearing news and seeking advice. The ceremonies have moved under the roof of a country Cherokee Indian Baptist Church and, excepting a minority of "pagans", at the precise seasons of the ancient ceremonials, delegations from country settlements join to reckon with the grace of the people during the seven days of the Cherokee Indian Baptist

Association Convocation. The Cherokee social unit is unchanged; its superordinate purpose -- simply "to be" -- persists. But tribal people are, by definition, people who live in response to environment and who, because environments are everchanging, change through time. Twentieth century America is the twentieth century Cherokee's environment, and, for sixty years, the Cherokee response to that environment has been inertia. Hence, the Cherokees are poor, uneducated, and out of it.

Cherokees are totally withdrawn from the school system of the state of Oklahoma. Their median educational level of 5.5 school years comes about because Cherokees, on the whole, drop out of school at the earliest possible moment. This, however, is not because Cherokees fail to appreciate the benefits of education. When this country was in its infancy, Cherokees mastered the art of civilization. They were once a universally literate people. They once established for themselves the finest school system in the western United States. Cherokees know more about the consequences of formal education than do we.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Cherokee tribe faced its greatest crisis. Epedemic disease, decades of warfare, and encroaching white colonists disrupted the Cherokee style of life. Whole towns had been burnt, and the eastern lands of the Cherokee nation were lost. Refugees lodged with distant kin. The day to day relationships of a man to his neighbors became now more challange than comfort. Men who were entrusted with irreplacable knowledge - of the past of the people, of curative medicine, of the sacrements which kept the people united and invulnerable -- were dead before their apprentices had been trained. Americans had become powerful and demanding. Game was scarce, the hunting grounds gone; Cherokee husbandry was demonstrably

inferior to that of whites and no arable land was safe from seizure. The people, high tempered and smarting, could not restrain their young men from striking back at the whites. When the irresponsible blow was struck, a frontiersman burnt out and his wife carried off, the whole people were made to answer. Each Cherokee act of vengeance against whites netted in reprisal a war of destruction. Each man's answer to the problems posed by a white nation to an on-going tribe was prized, and the answers, couched as responses to individual difficulties, were many.

To the problem of an Indian tribe unable to answer to whites for the uncontrolled actions of its individual members, nor to contest policy, came the answer of a Cherokee Nation Over a base of constituent small face-to-face communities, through arrangements that ensured that a common consensus among them determined the course of national policy, the Cherokees built a "voluntary native state" with a constitution, code of laws, and bicameral legislature.

To the problem of the loss of traditional knowledge through the premature death of Cherokee specialists came Sequoyah's answer: the native invention of a Cherokee syllabary. In the three or four years following the perfection of the syllabary in 1821, the Cherokees became universally literate in their own language. A rash of innovation followed. Cherokees became printers, readers, letter writers, jurists, codifiers of law, newspaper editors biblical scholars -- the printed word was woven into the texture of Cherokee life.

To the problem of white men who manipulated their laws so as to sanction the expulsion of the Cherokee from their homeland, and interpreted with oratory and Scripture the morality of this expediency, came the answer of Cherokees educated to contest whites on their own grounds. Equally, Cherokees imported white tutors into their own homes and sent sons to the best schools in the United States.

To gain education in the interest of preserving their tribal community, the Cherokee were for a while willing to tolerate the growth of a "cultured" elite. When the elite proved too little subservient to the direction of the tribe, the Cherokees turned to the principle of universal education, in their own language and in their own schools.

The Cherokees, already a tribal state before their removal in 1839, established the autonomous Cherokee Nation in Indian Territory (which later became Oklahoma). The struggle to cope with the greed of the State of Georgia and an expansionistic Federal Government, the rapid and differential acculturation which had been undertaken to rise to these tasks, and the trauma of Removal, broke the consensus of a people now of many opinions about how to survive. The tribe formed into factions and was able to unite only as a coalition. Even this was done. In the west, the Cherokee Nation was established in 1839. It was controlled by "traditionalists" not only in electoral office, but at home along the creeks and hollows of the Oklahoma Ozarks where, by rumblings of mass armed nativistic reaction, the most isolated and deeply traditional of Cherokees "~~cracked~~ cracked the whip" on their own national leadership. By the 1850's, the Cherokees were inseperably both a technologically modern, educated, literate, nation-state and a functioning tribe, unified by person-to-person interaction and an unyielding tribal world view. If to survive as a tribe, one had to compete as a nation, this price could be accepted with dignity.

Investment in education was, for the Cherokees, what investment for national defense has become for us, and Cherokees equalled us in lavishness and compulsiveness building for themselves a school system that was known to be the finest west of the Mississippi. What was defended by education was, ultimately, the country kin

settlement. With all the tendency of tribal people for sharing the skills essential to survival, still ~~take~~ tasting the bitterness of being sold out by an elite of "treaty signers", the Cherokee community repeatedly tugged at its government in an effort to maintain a school system adapted to the demands of the local community. For the traditional Cherokees, the Civil War seemed to break suddenly. When the armies finally dispersed, virtually no house was left standing, no field unscorched. The people, as a consequence of being blind to perilous developments in their relationships to the world of English-speakers, had been spared extermination, but they had been grievously ~~punsibed~~ punished for their lack of attention to their environment. When the smoke cleared, they began to force their government to hand over their schools, and when their schools were at their command, they poursed in their children. In 1873, the Cherokees were on the threshold of this resolution. Chief William P. Ross told his Nation:

> If the public schools have not been attended with all the success that might have been wished or expected, no deliberate, candid, mind, it appears to me, can deny that they have been productive of great good and are still the means of imparting much knowledge to the children of our country. No one denies benefits derived from public schools by that portion of our people who have a knowledge of the English language. But there are those who contend that the present system has been a failure so far as those are concerned who have not that knowledge. (Thornton 1926:36, italics ours)

That year, the Cherokee-speaking community showed its muscle. Immediately, bilingual school teachers were assigned to Cherokee-speaking communities, text books were printed in the Sequoyah syllabary, and English was taught as a second language. Pupils became both learned and bilingual. Graduates of neighborhood schools poured into the Cherokee Male and Female Seminaries which were by then among America's leading institutions of higher education. For the first time, sizable numbers of children from the "traditional" faction ran the gamut of their national school system and emerged as young professionals

in the service of their natal community. As these men took their places on the floor of the National Council, behind country pulpits, or simply on their front porches, the Cherokees reached the zenith of their experience with education. For even in the 1890's when the first generation of educated traditionalists was taking its place within the Cherokee Nation, their faction -- by then known as "fullbloods" -- became alienated from their own school system.

The rift between the traditionalist Ross Party and the acculturated but unassimilated Treaty Party in the Cherokee Nation grew into a complete falling-out between a 'fullblood" and a "mixed-blood" faction. The majority "fullbloods" held the "mixed-bloods" responsable for their mutual disasters during the Removal and the Civil War. Slighted, mistrusted, possibly misunderstood or possibly understood only too well, the mixed-bloods increasingly married white intruders in the Nation and became anxiously responsive to the growing and aggressive population of Boomers in Kansas, Sooners in the west of the Indian Territory, Railroad Boosters, and land promoters. By the late 1890's, the mixed-bloods had become not only a ~~xxxxx~~ majority, but were answerable to the expectations not of the tribal faction they had bested but of their aggressive white neighbors. Their last strategy of survival was to coerce their Cherokee Nation into becoming more "American" than America. The only sure vehicle for the production of men who would be both Cherokee nationals and super-Americans was the Cherokee national school system. The 'mixed-bloods" did become superbly educated, but as early as the 1890's the fullbloods were confronted with a school system predicated on forcible acculturation. Gone from Cherokee government was the presumption that a Cherokee tribal community could survive. By intent, the school system no longer fit the Cherokee-speaking country settlements. Even then, the experience of attending a school intended to reshape a community was miserable. Angie Debo

says of the Creeks, who were in a similar predicament:

> Perhaps it would have been wiser to conduct theday schools in Creek, for they were almost a complete failure in teaching English. The a-b-c method in vogue at the time was bad enough for the English-speaking children, but it was worse for the young Creeks. They learned to pronounce nonsense syllbbles like parrots, and to read rapidly in the First and Second Readers before they dropped out of school in disgust without knowing the meaning of a single word. Some of the teachers tried to work out a ~~xxxxxxxx~~ technique of their own by the use of objects, but they were under such strong pressure to show results in the glib reading of meaningless sentences that few were able to resist it. To make matters worse, none of the white teachers and few of the mixed-blood Creeks were able to speak the native language. (Debo 1930:309)

41

Nearly eighty years ago, the Cherokees were alienated from school. In the interval, the entire mixed-blood faction assimilated into the general society, the Cherokee Nation was dissolved, and the State of Oklahoma was established in 1907 with stewardship of all formerly Cherokee institutions including the school system. When the Cherokee community lost the power to deal with its circumstances and thus the power to dictate the terms of its education, participation in schools ceased.

Folk Anglo-Saxons and ~~the~~ their schools

Cherokees were coerced into the Indian Territory. The institutions they created there represent an attempt to make the best of an unfortunate situation. Folk Anglo-Saxons, by contrast, migrated into the Territory spontaneously and voluntarily. The institutions they created reflect the free working out of the kind of community they most desired.

Indian Territory was the last stop (short of California) for the original, individualistic, liberty-loving wanderers of the American frontier. The folk Anglo-Saxons who moved from Arkansas, Tennessee, and Kentucky at the turn of the century were drawn by the same selective process that caused whites to populate the entire southeast of North America. They were the perennial expanders-of-frontiers. Life on the frontier, for some people, is rewarding. On

V

the frontier, with its sparse population, nobody crowds in on a man. The North American environment is lush and rich. A man can live on fish and game, can create his environment to his own liking, can feel that he alone guides his own destiny, can bear the responsibility for his own actions. But frontiers in this country have always been temporary. Increasing numbers of people crowd in to newly opened territories. Towns are planted. Commerce flourisheds. A more complex division of labor is established. Institutions such as the church, the bank, and "the law" become powerful, and those who create for themselves a sedentary life which contributes to the growth and respectability of the community rank high in their favor. And the man who seeks to make life for himself and his family an individual creation, for whom this total responsibility is the essence of manliness, feels emasculated, boxed in, and "out of it". For such men, the time to move has come. His place is one jump ahead of the establishment. This kind of man, a seeker of the good life, a pirate, strong minded, an authoritarian within his home; a macho, often enough an outlaw, settled in the hills of eastern Oklahoma, wherever the Cherokees left a hollow unpopulated.

Folk Anglo-Saxons seldom came as single men. Usually by the time they felt ready to pull up stakes, they had a wife and a healthy number of children. Often siblings moved together wtth their families. Often, as immigrants frequently do, they settled and sent for their kinfolk. As these whites filled the hills of the Indian Nations, they settled with their kinfolk around them in separate, small, kin-united communities. Even as they fled "the establishment" they brought the seeds of the establishment with them. Perhaps the deepest contrast between the folk Anglo-Saxon kin based community and the Cherokee kin-based community is, among Folk Anglo-Saxons, the irreperable tension between individual manly authority and the demands of community life. Folk Anglo-Saxons do not consider life complete

without the minimum of community institutions. They concede that to deal with life, a man must learn more than his dad can teach him, for always the bankers, the lawyers, the womenfolk and the supernatural looms before a man and his sons. They assert only the right to create their own institutions as they wish them, schools included.

Folk Anglo-Saxon ~~xxx~~ demand institutions accomondated to what they themselves are. They are livers. In Madison and Newtown Counties of Arkansas, an environment precisely similar to the Oklahoma Ozarks, live the Anglo-Saxons who stayed behind. Their houses are sturdy, trim, ample, and rooted in the land. Their fields are meticulously cultivated, their gardens large. Orchards and flower gardens surround the houses. There are always several outbuildings and a large complement of domesticated animals. These farms are to provide an ample life, to load groaning tables with a variety of dishes, to pass on to one's sons. Churches and schools, too, have an aura of permanency and elaboration. These are communities of builders. Pride in community here is pride in the things you are building and in the things that have already been built by people participating in the construction of a way of life. In the Oklahoma Ozarks, houses are seedy, farming is done with a lick and a promise, church in a parlor or in a made-over log cabin is as good as in a church house, and schools likewise. Community pride is ~~p~~ride in the quality of life that can be ~~xxxx~~ lived here, in the color and passion and freedom of it, and the kind of man that can be produced by it. Whereas the people of Jasper, Arkansas feel gratified by an imposing courthouse, the people of Bunch, Oklahoma take pride in a ~~girl~~ girl who "shows up fine!" as Queen of the Strawberry Festival or in a boy who outdoes the pros at the local rodeo, or even when a gutty young burgler (who after all was only robbing town merchants) accomplishes a daring "human fly" escape from the county jail.

VI

What these people demand of communal institutions is an environment which allows for a maximum of passionate concern with others in an atmosphere of mimimum coercion to participate. To submit to coercion is the end of manliness; to have the strength and concern to "carry" another man through hard times without putting him under obligation is the fruition of manliness. Thus, the folk Anglo-Saxon church is usually a Baptist or Holiness church, churches where hierarchy is at a minimum, where preachers are of an chosen by the congregation, where a man can join his power with God's to heal his brother, where a man can shoutl praise where praise is due, but where the final responsibility is individual; a man must see the light himself and be saved by a revelation which is strictly an affair of honor between himself and his God. The political arena is the front porch of a crossroads store, not the county courthouse. No man is bound to participate in discussing the affairs of his community, but those with an ax to grind can count on an established place and a concerned audience.

The folk Anglo-Saxon school has traditionally been an institution outside the establishment. The folk Anglo-Saxon sees his house as a citadel. Men say "as long as I'm under my own roof, I'll do as I please", and, to their sons, "as long as you're under my roof, you'll do what I say." The community itself usually a claster of related patriarchial families, is an extention of the home. The major institutions of the folk Anglo-Saxon community, the church, the school, and the store, are important -- just by existing -- as evidence of the completeness of life.. They are each (and often interchangably) places where the community can assemble for the pleasure of eating, playing, dancing, making music, and enjoying a demonstration that life is as it ought to be, or for serious discussion and decision making that involves the community as a whole. The folk Anglo-Saxon community, embracing these institutions, is a self-contained

social unit. As individuals, folk Anglo-Saxons are strongly "anti-establishment." In the Cookson Hills, they produced and sheltered generations of Robin-Hood-like outlaws who stole from the rich and gave to the poor. To them Pretty Boy Floyd is a folk hero. Their vote must be courted by promising to represent "the people, not just the big shots in the county seat." Bankers, "big shots", and the lawmen who represent them are the enemy. Teacher, preacher, and storekeeper, with their relatively greater education and sophistication, are expected to be community resources, telling country folk what people in town have "up their sleeve" and acting as spokesmen for the interests of the rural community. There is, then, a clear boundary between the community with its institutions and "the system."

The schools that folk Anglo-Saxons built, rather than being the vehicle for entry into the establishment, were the last line of defense against it. Folk Anglo-Saxon men consider schooling (and schoolteachers) "sissy" and essentially feminine. At the same time, they believe that a practical amount of reading, writing, and arithmatic are as necessary for personal protection as a "hogleg" pistol. They discourgge any child from leaving school before he can read a newspaper, write a letter, and add a grocery bill. Beyond the attainment of these skills, unless a child seems interested in becoming an accepted professional within the community -- such as a teacher or veterinarian -- they consider education an affectation.

As folk Anglo-Saxons see it, the primary function of school is to impart useful defensive skills. The secondary function is to socialize and even "civilize" children within the community. Placing socialization within the school resolves some of the tension between father and mother in the folk Anglo-Saxon family. Fathers encourage their sons to be a reflexion (perhaps idealized) of themselves in their youth: wild, headstrong, reckless, and tough. They prefer their daughters to become polished ladies and, eventually, competent mothers, but if their girls are

a little flashy and "high stepping", they are not displeased. For children of both sexes, mothers are refuge from the strong and often wrathful hand of the father. Mothers are the source of warmth and stability in the household. As such they cannot also be disciplinarians, nor dare they thwart the wishes of their man. But mothers hope their children will surmount the very "evils" which the father encourages in them. They aspire toward gentle, docile children, free of the curse of wanderlust, who will stay rooted and sedentary. Between father and mother stands the schoob The conflict is resolved by granting paternal authority to the school and insisting that it teach children "discipline" and make them "work hard." By demanding schools that discipline a child and work him hard, folk Anglo-Saxons insist on the same opportunity they would give a child at home -- a situation in which he can demonstrate his own personal worth.

The schools of a folk Anglo-Saxon community are paft of the socialization system of a stable community. Within the community they support a sense of communal and of personal worth. They and the students who pass through them to take their place within the community are an essential part of the completeness of this communal life.

School, community and social system in eastern Oklahoma

In the 1930's, the amount of education attained by the various populations of eastern Oklahoma was little different than it is now. Cherokees did not go to school (the median number of school years completed by Cherokees was 3.3). They had long since withdrawn from participation in the general society. Folk Anglo-Saxons stayed in school long enough to learn the three R's and then, even as they win independence from an authoritarian father and acceptance as an adult member of the family by knocking the old man on his ass, quit. Children from

small town commercial families obtained enough education to enter and expand the family trade. Children who aspired to the professions finished school. The relation of school to the folk-like communities in the region was not ideal. Still, schools succeeded in imparting those skills which their constituent communities demanded. No one then concluded from contemporary statistics on educational attainment that eastern Oklahoma had an educational problem.

Now Oklahoma has a full-blown "educational problem". But the rough outlines of regional life are not that greatly changed, nor are new skills necessary for successfully living there. Now, just as much as formerly, a prosperous merchant, secure in the middle class of a county seat, is as likely to have a fourth grade education as a college degree. In these decades, it is the requirements for status and social mobility that have most changed, and the newly formulated expectation that "education" will confer both. Completion of education is equated with arrival in the middle class. But, although many academic critics of our educational system overlook the point, this was no less so in 1930. What is new is the expectation that all youngsters must arrive in the middle class by completing their education, along with new requirements for class mobility to which schools are tailored. Because schools are now exclusively producers of new entrants into the middle class, and because this is done by expanding the school's control over the student's environment, "school" acquires a new meaning even where the traditional formal relationship of school to community is unchanged. These relationships, too, have changed, but the relationship of school to community is now far more changed by the fact that school itself has become something different than what it was.

There was in eastern Oklahoma in the 1930's "the system', a status ladder, and differences in power and privelege, but, unlike the Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons today, no one was "out of it". Cherokees lived at a subsistence level with a "make do" economy that combined petty farming and wage peonage. Folk Anglo-Saxons, living as rural farmers and stockmen, were the majority population, and from their ranks sprang prosperous town dwellers to take places alongside the urbane "old settler" population of assimilated Cherokee mixed-bloods. Town and country combined formed a self sufficient social system, with people at each extreme of rank united by kinship. Countrymen, both as voters and producers, were securely in power, well able to reciprocate the favors they asked of their educated and sophisticated cousins in town.

Only this personal and reciprocal relationship between rich and poor was acceptable; beyond it countrymen resisted the expansion of power, repeatedly and forcefully. In 1917, Indians, Negros and whites of eastern Oklahoma entered the Green Corn Rebellion as tenant farmers bucked against the abuse of tenancy and the military draft. In following years, the growing forces of Socialism and Populism in the state checked the power of townsmen. Through the 1930's, the shelter and protection countryfolk gave Pretty Boy Floyd made of his career a morality play which illustrated the vulnerability of bankers and big shots in the establishment. Status was based on wealth and family. To acknowledge country kin and conform to the behavior they dictated and appreciated was the only means to sanction and secure social position. Seemingly diverse routes of mobility were equally based on kinship. Often an extended family would "back" the youngest son

and see to it that he was groomed for a "high class" life. Alternatively, an extended group of males would pool their resources, marry their sisters to advantage, and, as a kin group, become mobile. (And elsewhere in the United States, entire immigrant communities became mobile). Because there was rapid mobility by a variety of processes, yet mobility which was dependent on courting the power, kinship, and sanction of country folk, those who "made it" into the town middle class did not distinguish themselves, by their behavior, from country-folk. The country set the expectations of behavior for the whole social system. Only those few who were securely in the establishment could afford the appearance of being "cityfied" or "dandy". In no way was mobility contingent on behavior symbolic of allegiance to another class. Even now, the Senatorial candidate with the deepest drawl and the best banjo picker in his entourage draws the vote.

In the 1930's, eastern Oklahoma schools reflected the communities they served. Policy was made by neighborhood school boards and adjusted to local conditions. Always, school recessed in time to allow children to work through the peak agricultural season, whenever in the year it fell. School functioned outside of the establishment. Teachers were specialized members of the local community, working where they were born and raised, and the school, lending its facilities to pie suppers, dances, and "socials" was a focus of community social life. Neither teachers nor administrators had extensive specialized training, nor did they conceive of themselves as professionals. Jobs within the school system were not channels of mobility.

To the extent that school personnel sought mobility for their students, they, in league with parents and neighbors, sponsored and groomed selected pupils. To

To the community of which they were a part, they taught such skills as would enable its members to come to terms with the surrounding society.

In the years since 1930, eastern Oklahoma lost its integrity within the American social system. As an agrarian and rural state in an industrialized nation, its power and self sufficiency were bled off. By the end of the 1930's, the American small farm economy stalled, and displaced farm hands were sucked into the industrial maw. The Oklahoma dountryside depopulated as the opportunistic and the disenfranchised moved by the thousands to cities on the Pacific coast. The local economy dissolved, kin groups fragmented, and country men became powerless and un-influencial. For lack of personnel and power, the politifal and social institutions which linked town to country evaporated, and with them, the customary channels of mobility. The widening gulf between town and country was accompanied by a back-wash of urban immigrants into small towns, drawn by the opportunities for expanding service industries outside of the familiar grind of big cities. Rustic businessmen formed a community in interaction with urban newcomers adept at manipulating the system. At the same time, federal and state institutions, centralizing and expanding their control into rural areas, became "gate keepers" controlling the flow of cash into the local economy. Alienated from powerless country communities, the expanding population of townsmen came to depend on members of the intrusive urban middle class to sanction their status. In a diffuse way, the opinion of urban Americans was empowered to dictate standards of behavior to eastern Oklahomans, for the only channel of mobility remaining open is to join with the expanding generalized urban middle class on the terms it sets. Lacking any conception of the viability of rural community life, this new middle class sees as its mission the incorporation of Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons into the "mainstream of American life."

In a stagnant rural area, bereft of both farming and industrialization, with serious problems of unemployment and, because of migration, an under-representation of competent young adults, there is no ladder of occupations linking folk-like country communities and the new middle class. Only those individuals who can make the behavioral adjustment to working in a service industry, dependent on the goodwill of an impersonal middle class clientele, is assured mobility, and no sequence of occupations exists which allows Cherokees and folk-Anglo-Saxons to experience the behavior which pleases middle class consumers. As conditions for an impersonal but secure relationship, the new middle class demands of Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons an unspecified and mysterious personal transformation. The person that they are is unacceptable (what harried executive would purchase insurance from a salesman wearing coveralls, rolling his own cigarettes, and speaking hayseed English?) Including Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons within the prospering class of the region demands the construction, from them, of acceptable persons. To the schools has been entrusted this act of creation.

As these changes occurred, the school system was taken over by the establishment. School budgets were increasingly supplied by state and federal government, and control over schools was thereby centralized. Power moved away from the local community school board and was bestowed on county superintendants responsive to state legislatures. Teachers colleges and institutions of education grew in number and influence while teachers became a corporate group with their own professional associations. Requirements for teachers were set by the state rather than the country communtiy. Administration was centralized in the interest of effeciency, and, as roads were improved and bus services offered, schools were consolidated -- always over the protest of local people. The school system became an arm of the middle class, teaching became a route into the middle class, and teachers, of necessity, were

responsive to middle class definitions.

In the absence of reciprocities that bind it to country communities, the Oklahoma middle class conceives of itself as "the world" and of its behavior as the American norm. Lacking experience of the viability and vitality of Cherokee and folk Anglo-Saxon community life, members of the middle class see before them only low-ranked ethnic groups -- individuals who for some reason have not "made it" -- subsidized by middle class productivity. In the absence of reciprocity, the power to coerce these peoples into entering the mainstream of middle class life is seen as entirely legitimate. Through the school system, the middle class dictates to Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons the individual behaviors they must adopt before being admitted to the system. Since the middle class is an aggregate of individuated people who conceive of success as the result of individual goal-oriented self improvement, it does not occur to them to provide opportunities whereby entire communities of people may improve their collective rank, nor do "deviant" communities of Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons have sufficient power to demand this concession. Thus, to all but mobile individuals, the system has closed.

In the Oklahoma school system, as it operates now, the expanding new middle class has taken over. Except in the deepest back woods, middle class students set the tone ~~predominate~~ in the classroom. Thus, for Cherokees and Anglo-Saxons both, the middle class is an environment. Middle class students, naturally, are unthreatened by this environment. It demands of them only that they "be". But, conspicuously demonstrated to Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons by the successes of middle class students and the awards given anyone who approximates their behavior, is the necessity of learning to become middle class. In this situation, Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons, both people with a strong sense of self-worth, see only a reflection of the low rank definition of their communities. Being men whose

existence is embodied in a community, their experience of a school system which, with newly implemented techniques for dealing with the "under-privileged", attempts to bring them up to an abstract standard of middle class competence, denies their own communal concept of worthiness. As students, none of them having internalized the middleclass conception of a perpetually improving self, do daily battle with this judgement of them, school becomes a discomfort disporportionate to any know reward it can offer. Significantly, the Cherokee drop out rate reaches its peak at the point at which students transfer from backwoods schools, where they are a majority, to ~~centralized high~~ consolidated high schools, where town middle class students are the majority. ~~Perhaps~~ Perhaps, then, since for these students the school is a middle class environment, dropping out represents not failure but learning. ~~Perhaps~~ Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from the image these students have constructed of their environment. And perhaps the lesson that students are learning is that the middle class-as-environment does not permit itself to be dealt with when a community strictly demands that its children be educated but not transformed.

American schools and the "out of it"

What has happened in eastern Oklahoma, an area where there has been a "culture lag", is the start of what has happened elsewhere in America.

We hypothesize that in metropolitan ghettos as much as in country hollows, schools have become something "out of it" communities must deal with. Many scholars have eloquently told us already that our schools are the colonial service of the middle class, that they do not fit the working class and ethnic communities, and that programs designed to aid the disadvantaged are a fiercely disintegrative experience for the "disadvantaged" youngster. Why, then, this state of affairs? We suggest that the American social system, which in the 1930's included within it everybody from the working class to the aristocracy, has puffed into a middle class monopoly.

The new middle class, educated by its own school system to think that it is American life] has so expanded as to be itself "the system". There is, then, a double structure to America, for always what we have called "classes" have actually been ranked ethnic groups following one another through the experience of urbanization in an expanding, industrial society. Now, with a society that requires instead of productive laborers the expansion of producers and consumers of services, catering to the taste of an affluent middle class, the procession has halted. Groups retain their ranks, the Germans being higher than the Pbles, and the Poles higher than the Puerto Ricans, but the real distinction is between those in the system and those out of it. No new enterprises will suck in the remaining communities of people in the way that the expansion of the garment industry set Jewish feet on the urban ladder, and the expansion of construction contracting broke in the Italians. In the 1930's, America reflected the slow process of urbanization-through-experience. The working class defined American mass media, leaving its mark on Fred Allen's "Alley", broadway musical comedies, hearts and flowers greeting cards, and cinematic baseball biographies. Each of these reflected, as only the Maggie and J[1]ggs comic strip and a few Jewish monologists do now, days when Americans could climb the class ladder and still retain working class behavior. Now, the middle class is the system and the system is closed.

Formerly schools faced a pool of immigrants, flowing from the springs of Europe, naturalizing them as entire colonies, allowing one ethnic group after another to climb from ghettos and field hand's barracks, imparting technical skills with which workers could plunge into a productive economy and claw their way upward via social, political, and economic institutions that related muscular new communities to the expanding system. Now, schools face a stagnant pond of "deprived" individuals who were left behind in the rush, cut off, as are the

Cherokees and folk Anglo Saxons of Oklahoma, by the evaporation and contralizagion of local institutions. The stink of a man's sweat in a steel mill no longer counts; rather, individual aspirants must be deoderized to fill the slowly expanding niches in corporations and service industry "dealing with the public" where correct behavior, not productivity, is valued. We know full well that it was the experience of participation in urban life, not schools, that transformed the behavior of those in the system. How, then, can we presume that schools can teach urban behavior to "out of its" who do not experience participation in urban life? We know, too, from our experience with ~~exposure to~~ of American INdians as well as from our red-faced retraction of the "melting pot" theory of the melting pot" how doggedly intact ethnic communities resist attempts at forced acculturation or assimilation. Yet heedlessly, without regard to the well-being of the community in which the student is rooted, our schools are directed to prepare students piecemeal for employment situations where each must pass the inspection of a middle class "gate keeper". Can any theory of learning or social integration justify this arrangement to us, as intellectuals, and to the "out of its" who experience it? Or is it possible that what these communities (to the extent that they are, in fact, communities) are learning from this enforced manner of dealing with the system-as-environment is a lesson in their own lack of power? And if, though powerless, they refuse to surrender their communities, even at the price of remaining "out of it", what will be their response? And ours?

Specifically, we should ask:

If schools do exist to naturalize individuals from "out of it" communities and socialize them into the middle class, and if this is a legitimate job for the school system, how successfully is it done? What kind of out of it children make it thorugh school? Under what conditions do schools become a vehicle for entry into the system? How many children take over the self-definition presented them by the school system?

How resistant are individuals and communities to this kind of naturalization? What happens to individuals and communities that reject the school system's definition of themselves? Is their resistance uniform, or do some learn new ways to deal with the middle class (by "having a hustle", as Malcomb X called it) while others are embittered?

What is the real learning that takes place in school? From what they have experienced, what lessons do "drop outs" bring back to "out of it" communities? And what is it individual "out of its" learn that enables a few of them to "make it"?

Is it possible -- and if so, how -- for individuals and communities who are "out of it" to use the existing educational system for their own goals? Is it possible for "out of it" individuals and "out of it" communities to have education and a slice of the pie in terms of the kind of people they already are and the kind of community they already live in?

If the middle class is now the permanent environment of "out of it" communities, and if "out of it" communities (as have most American Indian tribes) prove unassimilable, under what circumstances can such communities have a viable relationship to their environment? What kind of learning will have to take place before this is possible? Who will dictate the terms of this learning?

EDUCATION OF THE NEGRO CHILD*

By Jules Henry

The education of the deprived child is now associated with the names of many workers.** All of these studies are of groups of children and most of them rely on test materials. Many emphasize the effect of language and usually stress the absence, in the life of the culturally deprived child, of a variety of cognitive experiences and material conditions not present in the life of other children. The conclusions all point in the same direction--that the culturally deprived child starts school with initial handicaps that make failure almost a foregone conclusion. Since, in spite of the evidence for the low probability of educational success of the deprived child, we know that some succeed, it is necessary to find out why they do in order that we can make more of them succeed. The only way to find out is to study individual children; and one of the best ways to do this is by a natural history method, in which research focuses not on groups but on particular children followed through their educational experience for a length of time manageable by the usual strategies of investigation.

---

*Prepared during the author's tenure as Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California. The material on which this paper is based was collected by Miss Gwendolyn Jones, as part of a study of the Pruitt-Igoe Project, a de facto segregated housing project in St. Louis, Missouri, under grant . Miss Jones is Negro.

**A few references, directly relevant to this paper are contained in the bibliography at the end. For an excellent review of the field, as well as massive bibliographic materials on deprivation and education, the reader is referred to The Disadvantaged Child, Joe L. Frost and Glenn R. Hawkes (eds.), Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

X 725

In this paper I report on a very small pilot project in the natural history of the education of two* Negro ghetto children from kindergarten through the first grade.

Objectives

The purpose of this project is to study the natural history of the education of the poor Negro child. The natural history of the education of a child is a description of the learning experiences of a child in its natural habitat. The question is: What is the habitat? What is a learning experience? Over how long a period is the history to be studied?

The child's habitat is home, school, and areas frequented by the child outside the home, together with the people in them.

For the purpose of this project education is defined as <u>all</u> the experiences of a child, because in all contacts with the external world the child may learn something. Under such a definition being beaten, hearing one's confused great-grandmother-caretaker be gulled by a sewing machine salesman or miscount a dozen and a half eggs are just as much learning experiences as sitting through a reading lesson in school. It can be seen, especially, from the example of the confused great-grandmother, that in humans there are both positive and negative learning; positive learning being learning congruent with dominant cultural conventions (including cognitive systems) and negative learning being learning not congruent with such systems. It can be seen from the above examples that "negative" is not synonymous with "aversive." One hypothesis of this study is that much more learning is negative among the poor than among other classes.

---

*Six children are being studied.

The natural history of a single organism covers its life; but this study will be limited to the child's learning experiences in kindergarten, in the first year in elementary school and in his home peer-group during that period.

The rationale for a natural history of the education of any child is that by studying the same child over a wide range of his activities we get a more complete idea of what helps him and hinders him in learning. When the same child is studied for two years in the home, in kindergarten, in the first grade and with peers, one obtains a better picture than when one studies him in only one of these situations. Furthermore, by following specific children over time, one obtains a more detailed and faithful picture of the vicissitudes of the educational experience of particular children than when one studies groups at a single moment in time, without reference to the question of the varieties of experience over time of each particular child. Thus in this study we aim at the significant detail of life experience of particular children rather than at global statistical formulations based on group studies. We think that study of the natural history of selected children will enable us to articulate, or, at least, to approximately articulate, the varieties of experience with one another. From the work of Deutsch, Riessman, Bruner and others we have been made aware of the probable relationship between milieu (home and peer) and school learning in culturally deprived children; we want to be able to specify that relationship in greater detail and with security.

There are factors in the home that are as important to school performance as cognitive capabilities and reinforcements narrowly construed. We refer to factors generally called emotional. The cases of two poor Negro children, David Smith and Rachel Potter, cast light on the issue.

David and Rachel

David and Rachel are described by the researcher as outgoing and alert when first observed in kindergarten in 1964. Now both are in Mrs. Trask's first grade class. Both children live in the same public housing project. Rachel's building has no bad odor, the halls in David's smell of urine. Rachel's family is stable "middle-class-like," David's is not.*

Rachel

Rachel is one of five children and lives with her father and mother. Father, an unskilled worker, is a family man, but seems rather aloof from the children. Mrs. Potter was observed to be always deeply involved in them.

The Potter's apartment has four rooms: a combination living room and kitchen-dining area and three bedrooms. The apartment is always neat and the furniture is so arranged as to make a clear distinction between living room and dining-kitchen areas. The front area presents the family "front" but the rear rooms are drab and bare. The children all have permanent bedroom assignments. Only members of the nuclear family live in the apartment.

---

*It is well known, of course, that ghetto Negroes are not a homogeneous class. ~~See~~

Mrs. Potter seems affectionate with the children though firm. She is always clear-headed. She is active in a religious movement, there is literature of the movement around the house, and the family has study periods devoted to the ideology of the movement.

The Potter children are very competitive with one another but are obedient to maternal intervention, which is generally in the interest of maintaining proper conduct--"Give Pam a chance Rachel, it's not your turn." The children often play at school work and TV-watching seems to be subordinated to it.

David

David's household is held together by his illiterate 59-year-old great-grandmother Mrs. Thompson. The following persons seem to live there at present with some continuity: David and his four sisters; his violent,(diagnosed) psychopathic but probably borderline psychotic, 35-year-old great uncle James, son of Mrs. Thompson; Mrs. Thompson's 15-year-old "daughter" Josephine;* Thomas, a grandchild of Mrs. Thompson. David's mother and father are separated and neither lives in the apartment. Marilyn, the mother, characterized as "wild" by Mrs. Thompson, is irregularly resident in the home, as is Sandra, another daughter of Mrs. Thompson.

The apartment has the same physical layout as the Potters' but is always in disarray, furniture is moved around frequently and no clear distinction is maintained between living room and kitchen-dining areas. The only person who has a fixed sleeping place is James.

Mrs. Thompson is almost entirely dependent on public agencies. ADC

---

*The Housing Project has not been able to verify Mrs. Thompson's claim that Josephine is her daughter.

checks go to Marilyn (David's mother) but none of it has been used to support the children.

Mrs. Thompson says she could not live without the children. Observation indicates she is well-disposed toward them but her contacts with them are rather impersonal. In speaking about them, in their presence she often belittles them and herself as well. She has had a stroke, her eyes are bad and she is quite confused but far from mentally ill. She is unable to discipline the children and has little authority or respect in the house. Mrs. Thompson's communication with the children is limited largely to commands and admonitions. In general, it is infrequent. David and his siblings interact competitively but most time at home is spent watching TV. The children were never seen to do school work at home. James is a punitive and threatening figure.

Observation in Rachel's Home

Both Mr. and Mrs. Potter are stable figures in the lives of their children. Mrs. Potter has frequent, intimate, and affectionate contact with them. The father is absent from the house during work and is at TV in the evening. Mrs. Potter is a housewife and Mr. Potter is definitely a "family man." There is a very warm relationship between Mrs. Potter and her children, and she appears sure of her position as an authority and as a nurturant figure. Rachel spontaneously includes her mother in her play.

> Rachel and several playmates are jumping rope.
> R: Mama, let me see you jump rope." Mrs. Potter smiled, said OK, and jumped rope.

(Rachel and several of her friends are playing school.) Mrs. Potter looked over at the kids, saw that Rachel was holding all the pencils. Mrs. Potter asked Rachel why she had all the pencils and Rachel replied that the other kids weren't supposed to be doing anything now. Mrs. Potter told her to give the children their pencils and Rachel repeated that they weren't supposed to be doing anything now. Her mother then told Rachel to give them their pencils. "Now--give Betty her pencil." Rachel sat pouting for a couple of seconds, and her mother said, "Give it to her!" and Rachel took one of the pencils and threw it to Betty who picked it up. Mrs. Potter told Betty to put the pencil back down and for Rachel to give it to her. Betty did, and Rachel handed her the pencil. She then gave Alice and Jennie their pencils back. Rachel immediately turned her paper over and told the kids what to draw.

The kids were still playing school and Rachel now was just sitting and watching the other kids as they worked and Mrs. Potter said, "Look at Rachel. Rachel is lazy." And Rachel said, "I ain't. I ain't lazy either." And Mrs. Potter said, "You just have one thing to do and that's wipe off the table, and you didn't do that well today." And Rachel kind of grinned when she said this.

We continued watching the children and every once in a while Rachel would ask her mother something related to the work she (Rachel) was doing, or her mother would comment. At one point Rachel said, "I'm going to make six mice with cheese," and her mother said, "Mice with cheese. Show me how you draw that Rachel." And Rachel began. When she finished she went to show her mother.

Rachel was telling the other kids that, "When I finish this you're going to have to draw it," and her mother said, "They're going to have to draw it, but you didn't draw that. Alice drew that." And Rachel said, "I know it, but I'm the teacher. They're supposed to do what I say."

These data show that there is a high level of verbal interchange between Rachel and her mother, that the mother intervenes constantly in Rachel's play and will participate in it if asked. Mrs. Potter's intervention is in the framework of positive learning: she teaches Rachel the right thing to do--not to be selfish, to give other children a chance

(fair play), not to try to run things. She intervenes in the interest of moral learning and justice. Her intervention is non-violent and she does not threaten Rachel with beating. There is an easy interchange between Rachel and her mother and she brings her mother her work to see as if she knows her mother will be interested.

Observation in David's Home

David's home is usually in a state of disarray, while Rachel's is always orderly. The different arrangement of furniture in the two apartments is illustrative. The furniture in David's house is usually covered with an assortment of articles; outstanding are the persistent piles of clothes that Mrs. Thompson is to iron.

> The observer (R) asks: "Whose room is this? Who sleeps here?" Mrs. Thompson: "Room? Whose room? Oh well, I guess it's Josephine's room. I guess she's supposed to sleep here, but you never can tell. The kids just sleep all over. You never know who's going to sleep where. Sometimes I have a hard time finding a place for myself." R: "Oh, the kids don't have any special place they have to sleep?" Mrs. Thompson: "No, they just sleep anywhere they want."
>
> We then watched television and there was very little comment during the program except for the kids laughing at some of the antics or jokes. When this program went off, "Petticoat Junction" came on and we watched it. During this program, David was sitting over on the bed also. Lila went over to where Mary was and tried to get her to move over so she could sit there too and Mary hit Lila saying, "Go away, move." The girls started hitting each other. Mrs. Thompson: "You all stop that. You all cut that out. Tillie, give me my switch, give me my belt over there." Both girls were crying by this time and Tillie looked in a drawer and came out with what seemed to be a plastic-covered extension cord, or a clothes line. It was looped several times over and she gave it to Mrs. Thompson who shook it at them saying, "You all hush up that noise, you just hush up that fuss," and she sat back down. Lila hit at Mary again.

> Mrs. Thompson: "I told you about that," and she got up, and with both hands hit Lila on the ears several times, saying, "I told you to stop that." Lila started to cry and Mrs. Thompson said, "Go on in there and clear up them dishes." On the table, where apparently someone had been eating, were three plates with a lot of bones on them. They looked as if they may have been pig knuckles or pig feet bones. Mrs. Thompson: "Go on in there and start them dishes." Lillie went also and after a few minutes David went too. R: "Where is Josephine tonight?" Mrs. Thompson: "Oh, I don't know. I don't know. I'll probably have to send these kids out to her again. I just don't know what I'm going to do with that girl."

It will certainly strike middle class readers as strange that nobody should have a permanent sleeping place in this home; but when one considers that in this, as in many ghetto homes, the population of the household is in constant flux, and that each new person (in the sense of new arrival or of a former inhabitant returning) may require new adaptations, it makes sense not to insist on rigid sleeping arrangements. Nevertheless, having a fixed space gives the child a certain advantage in learning over a child who is strange to such stability.

Note that there is no play and verbal communication is low. The observer never saw any school work being done in David's home, not even in play. Note also how quickly Mrs. Thompson moves from admonition to extreme violence. Readers not familiar with ghetto culture may not understand the significance of the plastic-covered extension cord: in some ghetto homes the cord is used to beat children, apparently because blows with the hand are so common that they lose effectiveness. At any rate, it is clear that Mrs. Thompson comes to feel very quickly that the situation is beyond simple scolding; that the situation is beyond her unless she uses violence. Note that as soon as the fighting blew over

and the children were ordered to clean up the kitchen, all verbal interchange ceased.

The answer to the question about Josephine is relevant to ghetto life: Josephine is 15 years old and probably already deep in the ghetto female sexual cycle.* Note that Mrs. Thompson feels helpless and that she objects to what Josephine is doing, even though she must know that such behavior is typical. Rejection of the ghetto female sex pattern in judgment, but accepting it eventually as a fact, is characteristic.

The next observation is of James and David. James, arrested because of violence to one of his sisters and for having smashed Mrs. Thompson's furniture, has been diagnosed as "psychopathic personality." The observation follows.

> James entered the room and said to Miss Jones, the researcher, "You David's teacher? You taking him somewhere?" And (Miss Jones continued) I said, "No, I'm not a teacher but I'm going to take him out today." Lillie (a sister) said, "Granma said he could go. She said he's supposed to go." James grabbed David, put his arms around him, and all of a sudden slapped him hard on the head. I guess I must have shown some obvious signs of shock, because James then rubbed David's head and said, "He knows I'm not mad at him. He knows the difference between my hitting** him when I'm not mad and when I'm mad." I gave a kind of half-hearted smile, nodded my head, and sat down. When we left, James was careful to pin up David's coat.

In the summer of 1965 David "took to running away," says Mrs. Thompson, "with a group of them little bad boys around here." Sometimes he wouldn't come home until two or three o'clock in the morning. People who knew him would report seeing him all over the place. Once he went all the way down the river. At her wits' end, Mrs. Thompson got somebody

---

*See Lee Rainwater, "The Negro Family, Crucible of Identity," Daedalus, Winter 1966.

**I'm not at all sure that this very good king's English isn't Miss Jones' modification.

to round up David's father, in the hope that he could stop the child from running away. Though David's father shows no interest in him, is not living with David's mother and never appeared in the home, he did come in answer to this summons and, Mrs. Thompson said, "When he brought David back he beat the living daylights out of him. He beat the boy hard for an hour; he just took off his belt and just wore him out."

When Miss Jones was still getting to know the family, she paid a visit one day, and David, whom she already knew quite well, was called into the room by Mrs. Thompson, but was quite shy in responding to Miss Jones:

> Mrs. Thompson sat down in the armchair by the window and asked me (Miss Jones) if I thought something was wrong with David, if maybe he couldn't learn. She said she tried and tried to get him to speak up and to say something but he just won't. She said she tried to get him in every program at school and then she corrected herself and said in all the programs at church. She said that there's going to be an Easter program and that there was a real good part in it and David was supposed to be in it but he won't say anything. He'll just get up there and mumble and you just can't understand him. She asked me again if I thought there was something wrong with him, that he couldn't learn. I told her I was sure there wasn't. I then asked her what church they attend and she said, "The People's Church." She said that "David just acts so dumb at times."

Mrs. Thompson belittles the other children, and herself. Thus David does not get anything at home that makes him feel intelligent. Observed in kindergarten with his peers at their desks, David is very talkative. When Miss Jones brought him and Rachel to the University to visit me he talked a blue streak, and coherently.

In the next excerpt from Miss Jones' observations we get a good picture

of Mrs. Thompson's confusion and the lack of respect for her by other adults that come to the house. The reader should recall that Mrs. Thompson is illiterate and cannot see well. The project had been trying to get her to an eye clinic for some time, but when I left St. Louis in June 1966, we had not yet succeeded, even though we were going to pay the fare and the cost of the glasses.

> I (Miss Jones) entered the apartment and sitting on the right hand of the table was a white man. On the table was a new portable Singer sewing machine. Mrs. Thompson sat down and said that she just wasn't too well, that she had just gotten back from down town (on a table and chair where the sofa had previously been were a lot of packages) and that that girl (her 15-year-old niece) had just talked her out of spending every penny in her pocketbook. She shook her head and said she just didn't know why she had done it, she just didn't know. I asked who she was referring to and she said that she was talking about that big girl that had been there when I was there before. She told me that she had said that she wasn't going to buy that girl anything for Easter because she had been disobeying her for about the past three weeks but somehow or other she had talked her downtown and just talked her out of all her money and buying her a new dress, pocketbook, shoes and just everything. She kept repeating that she just didn't know why she had done it. She then asked me if I thought maybe she was losing her mind and I said that these things happen to a lot of people. She shook her head again and repeated that she had said she wasn't going to buy that girl anything. She then said, "Someone must have sprinkled some [gooby] dust on her." . . .
>
> The white man looked in his pocket for something or other and stood up and began talking to Mrs. Thompson about this new sewing machine on the table. I think they were continuing the conversation I had interrupted when I arrived. Mrs. Thompson told me that she would have to give him the $12 next week and that she guessed he'd take the new machine back and she'd keep her old machine until she had the money and the salesman then said it was supposed to be $20, that she had already given him $8 so she could keep the new machine and he'd just pick up the money next week. She said no, she guessed he'd better take the new machine on back until next

week because you're supposed to have the $20. The salesman then explained that the $20 had already been paid to the company, that he had taken the $8 she had given him and put the other $12 in from his own pocket and given it to the company; so the $12 she would give him next week would be his, and the company had its money for the machine. . . .

The salesman went and brought in what was apparently Mrs. Thompson's old machine. He sat it down and Mrs. Thompson said, "You don't reckon I've got $50 in that, do you?" He said, "I beg your pardon." She said, "You don't reckon I've got $50 in that?" He asked if she meant that the machine wasn't worth $50, and she said, "I didn't think so but look in the drawer." She looked in the drawer and started taking some pins out. The salesman said that he had taken everything else out of the drawer and put it on the table back there. (I am unclear myself as to whether Mrs. Thompson was wondering if the machine was worth $50 or if she had $50 in the drawer of the machine.) . . .

Almost as soon as he had left the apartment, Mrs. Thompson's daughter Sandra, a woman in her middle or early 30's who looked as if she were about 7 months pregnant, entered the room. She was wearing a red and white striped maternity top and Jamaica pants. She was wearing a wedding ring. Sandra picked a cloth bag off the table that had the Singer emblem on it and said, "What this go to? I could sure use this. I could use this." And Mrs. Thompson said, "Put that down, Sandra, that's to my machine." The girl said, "I could sure use this; aw, it's not important." The salesman then re-entered the apartment and looked around and Mrs. Thompson said, "Sandra, get up and let the man have that seat." The girl said, "I'll get up when Sandra's ready to go." The man said, "Oh, that's all right," and he opened his attache case on the floor and took some papers out of it. While he was doing this, Sandra looked at him and said, "You don't want this seat, do you?" And he said, "No." Mrs. Thompson said, "Give the man the chair." Sandra said, "I done ask if he wanted it and he said no." She was still holding the cloth bag and Mrs. Thompson asked the salesman, "Is that bag mine? Does that bag go to the machine? What's it for?" He said, "It's to cover the foot pedal with, to hold the foot pedal when you aren't using it." She said, "Put that down, Sandra, it's mine." And Sandra said, "You don't need this. It'll be on the floor more than anywhere else anyway."

Mrs. Thompson then told the salesman, "I don't know, maybe I should keep my old machine this week. I made two dresses already but I've got three more Easter dresses to make tonight." (On

a pole lamp by the sofa two new dresses were hung. In all probability these are the dresses Mrs. Thompson has already completed.) The salesman said, "It's easy to use this machine. You'll be able to sew so much better with it." Mrs. Thompson then said, "But I don't know if I know how to work it and I got these three dresses to make. Maybe I should use my old machine to finish those dresses." The salesman said, "Here's the book and do you want me to show you how to use it again? I'll show you." Mrs. Thompson: "Not right now. I still think I ought to keep my old machine now, even if it is old. I've had it 20 years, let me see . . . yeah, been 20 years and I don't know if I can change now. It doesn't act right sometimes and it skips stitches at times but I know how to use it. I'm used to it." She then asked me, "Don't you think I'm too old to learn this new machine, these new things now?" And I said, "Oh I don't know about that." And Mrs. Thompson said, "I don't know, I'm too old to be getting into all of this debt. I'm paying $400 for that machine."

By this time Sandra had gone into the kitchen area and was putting something in a paper bag and she said, "Hmmp, this one's cracked," and laid an egg to one side. Mrs. Thompson: "Those are hard boiled eggs." Sandra: "No they ain't. I just took these out of the refrigerator." Mrs. Thompson: "Oh, how many eggs you taking, Sandra? I know you taking a dozen and a half. I know 12's in a dozen and a half a dozen would be about six more. You ain't fooling me; I know you taking more than a dozen." Sandra: (who in the meantime keeps putting eggs in the bag) "Aw mama, you don't know.". ~~The man on the sofa said, "How many in your family, woman?" Sandra: "Me." The man: "What about your husband? Where your husband?" Sandra: "Husband, what's that?" The man: "The man you married to, that's who I'm talking about."~~ Mrs. Thompson: "Sandra, don't take all of my eggs!" Sandra:(looking in the bag) "Aw, I'm just taking a dozen and one in case one of 'em breaks so I'll have an even dozen. I just took 14, maybe 16 or 18." Then she stops taking eggs and puts the bag to one side. The salesman has left the apartment again, I guess to go back to the car for something. Sandra then goes over to the piano and begins playing something. Mrs. Thompson: "Sandra, don't play the piano, it makes me nervous. I can't take it today." And Sandra keeps on playing and says, "Aw it's not long." Mrs. Thomspon: "Sandra, don't play the piano, it's making me nervous I say." Sandra: (finishes what she was playing) "I don't know but one number anyway."

The following points should be stressed in connection with these observations: (1) Mrs. Thompson's general confusion and inability to make a decision and stick to it. (2) The ease with which adults, colored or white, push her around. (3) The chicanery of the white salesman, who insists on selling Mrs. Thompson a sewing machine when she obviously will not be able to run it and when she is obviously confused about costs, and about her ability to pay for it. (4) The lack of respect for her by members of her own family. Thus David does not have before him models of adults who are honest or solicitous; and the major adult influence in his life, his great-grandmother, does not provide him with any firm basis for making a decision. She can't even make clear to him how one counts--not even the difference between a dozen and a dozen and a half eggs. In sum, David's home environment lacks important dimensions that usually give firmness to life, including perception and cognition.

The following suggests a further source of confusion and even despair.

> Mrs. Thompson began crying and said, "I just don't know, I'm at the end of my rope; all of the knots are being pulled and I've just nowhere to go now." She then said, "Excuse me." She went into the apartment and got a handkerchief and came back out and wiped her eyes and sat back down and said, "You see, that's one of the reasons I'm cleaning out all this junk now, so that when we move we won't have so much stuff to worry about." I then asked Mrs. Thompson where she was planning to move. She said, "I don't know, find someplace I guess, I don't know." I then asked her when were they going to move and Mrs. Thompson said, "When they throw us out of here, when they come and lock the door and set all our stuff outside, that's when we gon move cause we can't pay the rent and I don't see where any money is coming from so I just don't want to have all of this stuff setting out here when they lock us out of the house."

Mrs. Thompson was in constant trouble with the housing administration because of falling behind in her rent; they threatened to sue her and to throw her out, until they realized that she was a confused woman of exceedingly limited financial resources. Thus, at this point, David's problem is two-fold: constant material insecurity, and constant confusion, and an adult figure who, on the one hand, never knows where the money is going to come from to pay the rent, and, on the other, does not know how to protect the money she does have, by limiting expenditures.

Summarizing, one would have to say that the environment of David's home does not prepare him for the expectations of school.

Results from Kindergarten and First Grade Analysis

It would seem, now, as if the stage were set for the conclusion that David's performance in school was miserable from the beginning and that "he never had a chance," considering his background. Our studies of the two cases do not fit the stereotype. We give below a partial analysis of the data up to February 1966.

A. We coded observations of David and Rachel in kindergarten and first grade as follows:

1. Shows leadership or helpfulness.
2. Neglects work or acts up.
3. Gives right answer to teacher's question.
4. Gives wrong answer to teacher's question.
5. Gives confused answer to teacher's question.

The results for the two children are as follows:

Percent of type of answers as related to total answers

	Kindergarten	
	David	Rachel
Right answer	54	80
Wrong answer	20	19
Confused answer	26	1
Number of times showing leadership	8*	0
Number of times acting up	8*	0
	First Grade	
Right answer	70	55
Wrong answer	30	45
Number of times inattentive	2*	0
Thumbsucking in class	2*	0

*The last two items are not percentages but acts.

B. In February 1966 the children received identical report cards in the first grade

The teacher's comment on the two children follows:

(The researcher reports): Mrs. Trask told me that Rachel is a good student who usually thinks. she said the reason for Rachel's success in school appears to be more one of control and discipline than of capacity; with drive and push Rachel will be consistently good. David has it but he's not so controlled and he's getting into trouble in the school yard. He's becoming a behavior problem. He's very aggressive and is generally a little tough boy and won't study his words.

David took to disappearing from home for many hours in the summer of 1965 and was beaten black and blue for it by his father, who was especially located for the purpose, but who definitely has no interest in David. David is beaten by James, who has created violent scenes in the household. David was recently whipped by the school principal for urinating on the playground. He was also seen by the researcher to be struck by the teacher in kindergarten. On the positive side: Mrs. Trask, as contrasted with David's kindergarten teacher, is interested in him and plans so that he will perform at the best possible level in her class.

This brings us to the problem of the school.

The Culture of the School

Whether or not David and Rachel will or will not succeed in school is a function of the interplay between the culture of the school and the culture outside. The question is, What do we mean by "the culture of the school"? The answer to the general question is obtained by getting answers to the following subsidiary questions among other

1. What are the values, perceptions and attitudes of the people in the school? Since, when the child is in school, he is a member of the school culture, answers to the question apply to him just as well as to the school personnel. Thus for example, we study the class position of pupils, teachers, and principals; their values, their perceptions of one another, their attitudes toward the school, and so on. We want to know the <u>general</u> value orientations of school personnel as well as the values they use in judging one another and the pupils; and we want to know the same about the pupils. We want to know also how the pupils perceive

the teachers and vice versa; how the teachers perceive one another and the principal and how he perceives them. We want to know what the attitudes of all the members of the school culture are toward the school itself.

2. What is the internal structure of the school? What is the hierarchy of power in each school? Who are the pace-setters, the cultural maximizers, the arbiters of value judgments? What are the roles of the teachers and the principal? How much freedom of choice is there for a teacher? What are the relative power positions of the newcomers and the old hands; the insiders and the outsiders (if any)? What in general are the lines of formal and informal communication and organization? Is it possible to evade the formal structure? Does it really exist? What is the relationship between types of structure and communication and getting anything done? What are the patterns of socialization of new teachers into the on-going "tradition" of the particular school? What are the patterns of recruitment into the school? What are the "quit" patterns? What processes determine turn-over, advancement, etc.?

3. What are the formal and informal relationships between the educational bureaucracy and No. 2 above?

4. What is the relationship between the parents and the school system?

5. What goes on in the classroom? The format of the answer to this question is given in "A Cross-Cultural Outline of Education" (Henry 1960). Some illustrations from the kindergarten class of David and Rachel are appended.

The dynamic sum of the answers to questions 1-5 constitute the ethnography of the school; and from this one should be able to derive a

general answer to the question, What is the culture of the (particular) school? This should yield an answer to a question like, Why did David's kindergarten teacher hit him? At the end of the study, the answer to the question should look like* the following: David's teacher hit him for the following reasons: (1) He acts up in a school which insists on strict order and discipline even in kindergarten (value of order). (2) The teacher is a middle class teacher who devalues David because of his background. (3) The principal and teachers believe that the only thing that "makes an impression on kids" is a strong arm. (4) The school district is under pressure to "make a showing" and "it's kids like David who give us all a black eye." (5) The teacher's promotion is related to the achievement records of her children. (6) The principal is a "no-nonsense" man who believes in holding a tight rein on his "outfit." (9) The principal knows he is under scrutiny by the district superintendent whose ambition it is to make a showing with his plan for bettering the condition of the children in his district. (10) Since David has his own emotional problems that do not allow him to toe the mark, he is often inattentive, etc., and so arouses the teacher who, under the conditions stated, is prone to express her irritation with children by violence.

Model

If we let O stand for the outcome of David's total educational experience, E for his experience at home, P for his peer-group experience, and S for the influence of the school culture and T for time, then

$$O = f(E+S+P)T$$

---

*This is merely a paradigm, not a conclusion.

The fact that David's teacher struck him or that he succeeds in the first grade is a function of the influence of the school culture, and of his relationships with his peers and of his life at home--in the widest sense, of an emotional as well as a cognitive experience. Complex as each of its elements is, the model suggests the following hypotheses, among others: (a) that the outcome of schooling depends on a complex of factors; (b) that if one factor, let us say E, takes on a largely negative significance--negative learning exceeds positive--this might be overcome if certain factors in S were maximized--like an improvement in teaching methods; (c) that if one factor is maximized--like, for an example, a great improvement in teaching methods--it might be cancelled by a negative indication in another, as in the home or peer group situation, for example. We have entered T as a multiplier with some hesitation, and with the reservation that T is no more a simple multiplier than E+S+P is a simple sum. We have in mind the fact that the longer any process continues the greater effect it will have on the outcome. We add the time dimension also because, the study is a life-historical one. Meanwhile, the presence of T suggests sampling O for particular children at particular times.

Conclusions and Position

Understanding of the educational vicissitudes of children will be expanded by passing from correlational analysis of groups to the study of individual children in their natural habitat; and it is not only the culturally deprived that will be helped in this way but all children.

Our findings, miniscule though they are at present, suggest the obvious: that the outcome of a child's experience with the formal educational system is the sum of several types of experience--home, school and peer group. Any one factor taken alone cannot explain why some fail and others succeed. Plans for improving the education of children must be based, therefore, on an understanding of the relationship among the factors. While we cannot know what is going on in the life of <u>every</u> child, we have to assume that among deprived children they always suffer a heavy burden of extra-curricular environmental disability. Provision ought to be made for it in the school culture. Most obvious is the training of teachers to handle these children. Too often, among Negro as well as among white teachers, the attitude toward the ghetto child is such as to make his life in school almost as harsh as his environment at home. The result is an accumulation of anxieties beyond the point where school learning is possible.

745
23

Selected References

Ausubel, David P. A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Considerations. The School Review, Winter 1963, pp. 454-463.

Bernstein, B.
1960 Language and Social Class. British Journal of Sociology, 11:271-5.

Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning. In A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson (eds.), Economy, Education and Society. New York: The Free Press. 1961.

1962 Linguistic Codes, Hesitation Phenomena and Intelligence. Language and Speech. 5 No. 1.

Bruner, J. S.
1960 The Process of Education. Harvard University Press.

The Cognitive Consequences of Early Sensory Deprivation. In Philip Solomon (ed.), Sensory Deprivation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.

1964 The Course of Cognitive Growth. American Psychologist 19:1-15.

Crandall, Virginia. Achievement Behavior in Young Children. Young Children, November 1964, pp. 77-90.

Deutsch, Martin. Nursery Education: The Influence of Social Programming on Early Development. The Journal of Nursery Education, April 1963, pp. 191-7.

1964a Papers from the Arden House Conference on Pre-school Enrichment. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development 10:207-208; 249-263.

1964b The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 25:78-88.

1964c Some Psychological Aspects of Language in the Disadvantaged. Presented at the Boston University Development Conference on the Teaching of Disadvantaged Youth (ms).

1964d with Alma Maliver, Bert Brown and Estelle Cherry. Communication of Information in the Elementary School Classroom. Cooperative Research Project No. 908. Institute for Developmental Studies, Department of Psychiatry, New York Medical College (ms).

Henry, J.
1955a Culture, Education and Communications Theory. In George Spindler (ed.), Education and Anthropology. Stanford Univ. Press.

1955b Docility, or Giving Teacher What She Wants. The Journal of Social Issues, 11, No. 2.

1957 Attitude Organization in Elementary School Classrooms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 27 No. 1.

1959 The Problem of Spontaneity, Initiative and Creativity in Suburban Classrooms, ibid., 29 No. 1.

1960 A Cross-cultural Outline of Education. Current Anthropology. 1:267-305.

1963 Culture Against Man. Random House. Chapter 8. "Golden Rule Days: American Schoolrooms."

1965a Death, Fear and Climax in Nursery School Play. In Peter Neubauer (ed.), Concepts of Development in Early Childhood Education. Charles C. Thomas.

1965b White People's Time, Colored People's Time. Trans-Action, March/April.

1965c Hope, Delusion and Organization: Some Problems in the Motivation of Low Achievers. In Lauren G. Woodby (ed.), The Low Achiever in Mathematics. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. OE 29061. Bulletin 1965, No. 31.

1966 The Study of Families by Naturalistic Observation. Psychiatric Research Report 30. American Psychiatric Association 95-104.

Olson, James L. and Larson, Richard G. An Experimental Curriculum for Culturally Deprived Kindergarten Children. Educational Leadership, May 1965, pp. 553-558.

John, Vera P.
1963 The Intellectual Development of Slum Children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 33:813-822.

Riessman, Frank
1962 The Culturally Deprived Child. Harper and Row.

Appendix

Observations in David and Rachel's Kindergarten Class

> Mrs. B.: "Michael, will you collect all the papers, please." David said, "Mrs. B., can I help?" Mrs. B.: "He can do it by himself."
>
> Mrs. B. left the room....The noise level is 3....David came up to me and asked, "You want me to keep them quiet?" I told him that I was not in charge and he returned to his seat.... The noise level is up to 4....David yells, "Everybody be quiet! Be quiet!" The noise level drops to 3.

However, several months later he began to be inattentive in class, helping others with their work rather than doing his own, and getting into trouble with the teacher:

> Everybody is at the weather dial paying attention except for David who is opposite me looking at a book....Mrs. B: "Who can tell us what the weather is outside today? Raise your hands. David." David was running around the book table at this point. He didn't say anything....Mrs. B.: "Let's come back to the piano, little people," and everybody was over to the piano except David who is still running around the book table.
>
> Mrs. B.: "Let's bow our heads," and the class began saying the prayer. However, David, George, Frederick, and Maurice were not paying attention.

To a considerable extent school for David is now an institutionalized version of the harsh, impersonal treatment he receives at home.

> When I arrived in Mrs. B's class, the children were seated around the piano and she was slapping some little boy (Benny) on the side of his head saying in time to the slaps, "You will listen to me."
>
> 11:30. Mrs. B.: "We will all wash our hands at one time, children. Do not wash your hands now, please. 11:31. "Children, what's wrong with your ears this morning" What did I just say?"

She was referring to washing hands. 11:32. "Billie," and he says "Huh?" Mrs. H.: "Come here...Where are you going?" Billie says, "In the bathroom." Mrs. B.: "For what?" Billie: "To wash my hands." Mrs. B.: "What did I just say? Boy, if you don't sit down," and she paused, "I'm going to spank you."

Mrs. B.: "David, I asked you to use your hand, not your mouth." She whipped David rather hard with the pointer.

Mrs. B. returns and says, "Little people you are not to do anything with these papers. Now I didn't tell you that. All little people who have put something on your paper, ball the paper up and put it in the trash can please." About thirteen students do....She reiterates about putting the paper in the can and says, "You children are so hard-headed, why did you mark on that paper? I didn't say anything about it. You didn't know what I wanted to do with them." Some little girl balls her paper and Mrs. B. hits her on the arm several times with the pointer and says, "Why did you mark on this paper?" Then she says, "Lock your lips. All those who have to throw papers away line up at the desk." When they do so she gives them another piece of paper and says, "You're going to have to get a spanking." However, she does nothing to carry out her threat.

Mrs. B.: "Children, why did you draw lines? Why did you draw lines" I asked you not to make lines. You little people don't listen. Those of you who drew lines, put your papers in the waste can. You'll have to do your papers over. You'll be behind the other children."

Mrs. B.: "Little people, stand behind your chairs, don't bother the crayon." And the children still played with the crayon whereupon Mrs. B. went over to Pamela Frenchie and David and hit them while she was saying in an angry voice, "Keep your hands away from the crayon. You little people are hard-headed." She really hit these kids this time.

Proper, correct behavior is very rarely rewarded and about the only time Mrs. B, appeared aware of the child as a person, as an individual, was in a punishment situation. Since Rachel was well-behaved, did as she was told and never volunteered, we have no observations on her that parallel those on David.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PRIMARY GRADES[1]

Frederick O. Gearing
University of California
Riverside

The author is:

Associate Professor of Anthropology,
the University of California, Riverside;

Member of the "Statewide Social Sciences
Study Committee" of the California State
Board of Education, a curriculum-revision
study group;

Director "From Desegregation to Integration,"
an experimental primary program of the
Riverside (California) Unified School District.

Recent history seems to have created three new social facts which the schools, with ingenuity and much luck, may (or may not) be able to handle. These new social facts are most clearly evident in the primary grades, kindergarten through third grade.

By recent history we mean history since men started congregating in cities and started building economic systems and political systems centered in the cities, which is to say, history since about 3000 B.C. By recent history we also mean very recent history, since the contemporary revolution in science and technology got under way, since 1945, say.

These three social facts are most evident in the early grades. We shall here briefly look at three aspects of a child's growth, all made newly more difficult and riskful: the development of the child's social identity, his neurological development, and the development of his cognitive abilities. We shall be looking at these matters from what may seem a curious perspective, the perspective of anthropology which reminds us that history as men commonly think of it--the human career since men began to congregate in cities and began to leave written records--comprises less than 1% of human history. That leaves virtually the total human career unexamined. There is some probability, as we shall show, that the human nervous system, through natural selection during the long duration of that earlier 99% of the human experience, became <u>biologically</u> adapted to earlier conditions of human life when all men lived in communities of some 50 to 500 souls and there were no cities. There is virtual certainty, as we shall also show, that ancient men around the world became, through long trial and error, <u>culturally</u> adapted to life in those very small communities and that more

recently, urban men long have suffered because of cultural adaptations which are grossly inadequate to life in cities and in nations run from the cities.

This last can of course be seen today in war and the threat of war and in the now-annual summer riots. This can also be seen as dramatically in any kindergarten, in the form of the child's struggle for comfortable identity, in the riskful and halting course of the child's neurological growth, and in the evident difficulties in adequately developing the child's cognitive skill, given the world into which he soon will move.

About each of these three realms enough is now known to suggest lines of cautious and watchful application in the schools, thus to learn more. In this, as in every interesting or serious matter bearing on education, the society is ultimately dependent on the energy, ingenuity, and wisdom of the good teacher. Others can only stand back and watch closely and hope, thereby, to recognize the gross contours of fact and problem.

The anthropological habit is to stand far back indeed, to view the here-and-now against the backdrop of the total human career and the total resulting diversity of contemporary human kind. That habit will be indulged here. Paradoxically perhaps, frequent allusions to a very modest, local experimental program will be made. That parochial impulse will also be indulged. The program is shaped by the ideas here reported and in it the writer has enjoyed playing some part.

* * *

Urban heterogeneity: the problem of identity.

Mankind has passed virtually the totality of the human career in communities that were very small. Measured by political boundaries (as known from direct observation of latter day tribal peoples living under conditions analogous to those of earlier men) these communities were small indeed, little "sovereignties" of some 50 to 500 souls. These small communities were rarely wholly isolated one from the other; frequently daughters in one became wives in the other in systematic exchange; there was a good deal of economic exchange among them and a great deal of routinized feud-and-alliance and of less routinized war. It would strongly appear, however, that, whatever the varying amounts and kinds of bumpings-together, the social boundaries of these small groups were clearly marked: in such communities there was little room for question as to whether any single person at any given time was "in" or not.

In small, closed societies of this kind, one thing seems almost always true: there is great homogeneity of mind.[2] The culture of a people is like a code, carried in the heads of that people. In even very small societies, that cultural code is staggeringly complex (so much so that no anthropologist has even approximated the full description of any people's culture). Among the items of any cultural code is a very large set of shared ideas by which that population arranges itself, and hour-by-hour rearranges itself, as personnel--a battery of public identities men are expected on occasion to assume and a corresponding battery of public roles men, so identified, are expected to act out. In the simplest human society the identities a man is expected to assume in a day or year numbers several dozens, and over the total lifetime

of that man the number is certainly far above a hundred. However, in any work-a-day encounter among fellow members of such a small society there can be little question as to the particular public identity each man should assume or about the particular public role each, so identified, should play. Whether all men equally "like" those cultural dictates or always conform is a separate matter. Small communities enjoy homogeneity of mind, a homogeneity of understanding as to the cultural code in all its internal complexity and differentiation.

For a member of such a small society, there is thus remarkable clarity as to his public identity--clarity in respect to the boundaries of his little society and his own membership in it, and clarity in respect to the multiplicity of public identities he can publicly assume as a member of that community. Into such societies children are born, and in the context of that clarity children grow into the sense of identity every human must acquire, psychologically to survive.

A few thousand years ago in the Near East (and, roughly simultaneously in two or three other places) men stumbled upon the art of growing grain. In a brief while, by 3000 B.C. in the Near East, cities had appeared on the scene, made possible and in some complicated sense made necessary by that invention, agriculture. With cities the goings and comings of men dramatically increased--traders, soldiers, and priests, and others variously caught up or displaced by them, moved about over great distances in greatly increased numbers. It is almost true that the "stranger" came into being as a social fact. Cities came to command power over the hinterland and other cities and large states formed, and this further increased the movement of men. With all this, homogeneity of mind began to be replaced by degrees of cultural heterogeneity and, by

the same token, earlier clarity as to a man's public identity began to give way to varying degrees of ambiguity and to hostile dispute. We are today a remarkably heterogeneous nation, and as a nation we are closely tied to others in an even more heterogeneous world. There is some question as to whether man is biologically able to live with such heterogeneity, though able or not he so far does. There is no question at all that human wits have badly lagged in ideas and devices which might bring the discomfort and risk of so living within tolerable limits.

The marked heterogeneity of mind of adult America is obvious and specifically evident are the ambiguities and the active fears and hostilities as to the many identities men ascribe to themselves and their fellows based on public perceptions of race, economic class, and ethnic membership. White literals and White racists, for evident example, are at bottom curiously alike. Racists can think of Negroes only as Negroes; many liberals try hard to think of Negroes only as fellow Man and can hardly utter in public contexts the word Negro. Both are curiously "locked" (probably because both feel equally desperate). Of course the fact is that, in this generation at least, every Negro man is both, but neither he nor his White fellows can today find much comfort in that fact.

Into such an adult world children are born and in that context children must develop whatever sense of identity they can. In the schools the painfully vulnerable sense of identity of young children is quite evident. As every teacher with relevant experience knows, when Negro children come to kindergarten, their most angry epithet for fellow Negro children is, "You're black!" It would appear that for great multitudes of Negro youth the first time they announce to the White world "I'm black!" is with a molotov cocktail in Watts.

Human identity includes social identity and this has always been multiple--that is perhaps the most striking feature of the human animal. Thus by a child's identity we here especially mean the multiplicity of a child's social identity (that much of the total psychological entity of his sense of self). We mean the child's sense of commonality with all children in his universe of experience, to his sense of special commonality with some children in contrast to others, to his ability to move from the wider identity to one or another more narrow identity and back as appropriate to his purposes, and to his general sense of confidence about himself and respect for himself in all this.

The narrowed identities of the children in our schools are, of course, many (as boys in contrast to girls, older in contrast to younger, etc. etc.) but in our society these narrowed identities certainly include the array of socially-recognized categories of race, economic class, and ethnic origin. These last are "noisy"--to a young child confusing and threatening--and it is in respect to these that the child's sense of who he is is usually most vulnerable. That vulnerability takes very different forms as between "majority" and sundry "minority" children and is perhaps more visibly paraded by the latter, but the vulnerability is almost invariably present on both sides; this is one of the prices all children pay for the great isolations in contemporary life.

This much we grossly know. How can we learn more and get on with the task of educating children? Desegregated primary classrooms fortunately make evident, thus potentially handleable, the undeveloped and vulnerable state of a child's sense of identity in these dimensions. Desegregated classrooms also provide a setting, apparently the most rightful yet the best setting, for getting on with the development

and strengthening of each child's sense of his social self, this to the advantage of all the children.

To the ends of both revealing those vulnerabilities and handling them, an anthropological strategy has shown promise in modest experimental use in local integrated classrooms. The study of some "third culture" seems to provide a classroom climate which allows young children to see themselves and their fellows afresh and to begin to feel comfortable with what they see. "Third culture" is a figurative manner of speaking; "N plus 1 culture" would be more accurate, N being the number of subcultures represented in the classroom. The strategy recommends the classroom study of some alien culture, any alien culture not represented in the classroom.[3]

An early report on this experimental work as of 1965-66, prepared by the present writer, reads in part as follows:

> We are a remarkably heterogeneous nation. In the schools, therefore, classes include children drawn from the ethnic and racial variety which is the nation. More narrowly, most classes now include some students from families who fully participate in the national social and economic establishment, and include other students from families (minority mostly) who, in varyingly explicit degrees, are pitted against the establishment as it is now constituted. A struggle is joined, and of this complex struggle, the most conspicuous part is the Negro struggle for equality. All children of five have learned, long before they appear at school, that some ill-defined struggle is going on and that it is a realm fraught with tension and, to them, mysterious danger. Thus in class the student "of" the establishment is typically asked to attend matters which are to him "mine", while the other student, from a family pitted against the established order, is asked to attend those same matters which to him are often less familiar and somehow "theirs", and these two young students look to each other cautiously, trying to comprehend. It would be difficult to gauge the degrees of differential advantage and motivation such contrasts create. It would seem, however, especially unwise to under-estimate the possible effects during the earliest school years--the years before those mysterious fears are at all understood and handleable. This, in the usual class using usual curricular materials.[4]

> [Two experimental classes are] studying American Indians and [are] in some literal sense equalized by that. All the [children] find the Indians equally unfamiliar, and none can quite claim them.
>
> A [second] more profound result is possible as well. Each child of five is much preoccupied to discover who he is. At school, when children of various racial and ethnic groups join in work or play, that becomes additionally difficult because those very racial and ethnic differences seem to the child often to be somehow charged with half-understood meaning and danger. Big Cat,[5] recall, is also trying in the story to discover who he is; Big Cat is trying to learn and to cope with a set of rules about being a boy and about becoming a man--one kind of boy and one kind of man. [These experimental classes are] made up of Negro and White children, and the children are studying Indians and Big Cat. A remarkable thing often happens. The children seem often caused to relax, to loosen-up, to think differently and perhaps more clearly about themselves and each other and sometimes to speak with more candor about themselves and each other in the context of their joint preoccupations with Indians. In such a context a child's world necessarily becomes very big; not Negro-and-White, but Negro-and-White-and-Indian, which is, to a child (and to a thinking adult), not one-half bigger but <u>incomparably</u> bigger, an altogether different kind of world. The children seem able, in a word, to triangulate, each with the Indians and with each other. Matters which bother them and which in other contexts would be too fraught with tension to think clearly about, leave alone utter, can be thought and said, and can become to the child somewhat objectified and more nearly handleable by the mere public utterance....[6]
>
> Experience to date strongly suggests that children newly see <u>themselves</u> by looking at those Indians--newly see their own families by looking at Indian families, and by extension, see their own education newly by looking at Indian education, see their community by looking at the organization of an Indian community..., and so on.
>
> Nor is this puzzling. It is built into the very neurology of man that we see best by comparison. A leaf, on first, hard visual inspection is but grossly comprehended; but if one picks up a second leaf and looks at the two, a host of features of that first leaf newly reveal themselves to the mind. This elementary fact appears to be built into the very structure of the brain of this symbolizing animal, man.

A Negro-and-White-and-Indian world is a far different, remarkably wider thing to a child than the Negro-and-White world he has heard about and has seen glimpses of and now directly knows in microcosm in his heterogeneous classroom. It is evident, also, that a Negro-and-White-and-Indian world seems more comfortable to the children and helps to provide a climate in which each child can look into himself, can see

himself newly in some measure, and in his own time, when he feels for whatever reasons ready, can publicly offer something of himself to his fellows. One little kindergarten boy, a lower class Negro child, in such a context asked of the teacher, "Do the Indians cuss like we do when they get mad?" It is at least possible that that child was in effect saying to the upper-middle-class White child next to him, and to himself, "Do you want to know who I am? This is who." If so, it is also possible that that child grew a foot at that moment.[7]

Human social identity is multiple. Children necessarily sense a commonality with all other children, as against adults; children also necessarily sense special, narrower commonalities with some children as contrasted with others, including those special identities which are today loaded with fear and hostility. One mark of a vital, growing sense of self is the child's increasing capacity to move among his several social identities in some confidence and comfort.[8]

* * *

Urban life and the problems of neurological and cognitive development.

Human history goes back at least 500,000 years. Of that time, we saw, man has lived with cities but the last 5000. Before, all men lived by hunting wild animal life and by gathering wild vegetable food, and as we have seen, all men lived in communities which were very small. Human biology, including the human nervous system, appears quite adequately adapted, as one might suppose, to the necessities of that earlier condition of life. Selective pressures, during those hundreds of thousands of years were severe, and, given those pressures, that was time enough for

the processes of natural selection to bring about the physical being we now are. Of course most men no longer live by the hunt and no longer live in small sovereign communities.

The schools must live with the new fact that men have become urban. Specifically, the schools live with the fact that the human child appears to be biologically equipped to learn what he would need to learn, when he would need to learn it, in order for the child-become-man to take his effective place in small, hunting communities; yet the schools must somehow help prepare today's child to take his place in another kind of world, whether or not he is biologically best-equipped to learn what he needs to learn.

I briefly raise three questions, each of them in respect to a learning child in a small hunting society, then in respect to the children in our homes and schools. First, <u>how</u> do they go about learning? Second, <u>what</u> must they learn? Third, <u>how long</u> do they have in which to learn?

<u>How do they learn</u>? Children in small, hunting and gathering societies learn, surely in very significant part, through imitation. Preachment, of a direct educational nature, is not unknown in such societies, but this typically occurs mainly at critical points, as when a boy becomes, through ritual passage, a man, or as at marriage. In such societies, however, young children are almost invariably found playing at hunting with toy bows and arrows and playing at gathering with toy digging sticks, every day acting out in general the adult life they see around them, in these and other critical dimensions. Such learning through imitation includes, critically, learning the language, learning the names of things like bows and deer, and learning hunting

and the like as that is assisted by language. The human child's developing neurological equipment permits that this learning through imitative play can be actively under way as soon as the toddler gains enough mobility to keep up with slightly older children. Further, this sort of learning, through imitative play, with the required coordination of hand and eye and body and ear and whatever else, all mediated by language, this activity itself is, we are told, the best exercise of the child's developing neurological system.

We must, indeed, go still further back, to the prehuman primates whose biological systems man in large part inherited. Here learning occurs, virtually exclusively, through imitative play, for these animals do not of course enjoy that wonderful aid and riskful substitute, language.

The children in our homes and schools would appear to have the same human neurological system as earlier men, developing in the same way. But they hardly have the same occasions to put it effectively to work. These children are more likely to play at child-like perceptions of cowboys and Indians than at any of the adult roles around them, especially the male adult roles around them. In a word, the child today must learn under some handicap, depending relatively little on acting-out, depending much more on words and whatever they can come to mean to him.[9]

What do they learn? I refer here, not to the specific information a child must acquire (for this obviously varies with each people, indeed with each family and each individual) but rather with the basic cognitive skills a child must master. This is of course a very complex matter; knowledge is sketchy, and I shall simplify egregiously. A child, born into a small hunting society can live an effective adult life if he comes to command a modest array of fundamental cognitive skills. Of these,

I shall describe one that is pivotal: classification of one sort, classification as guided by language, by the names of things in the vocabulary of that people. Above, we imagined children at play imitating hunting and imitating the gathering of wild vegetable food and so learning those adult skills. But of course, those children are invariably found to be doing more; they are acting out adult roles, the roles of named adult identities as that of a "father", and so on. Boys, not girls, usually hunt; girls, not boys, usually gather, according, of course, to the adult division of labor which is being imitated. This is a very gross example of the child's already well-developed mental command over certain named classes of things as recognized by his community; on the social side, sundry named male roles (as husband, father, etc.) and sundry female roles, and in the realm of that people's environment, sundry named animals and sundry named plants. All of these are, of course, named classes. This cognitive skill, the ability to think in terms of named classes, is acquired very early--it's development goes hand-in-hand with the child's learning of his native language.[10]

In short, a child born into a small, hunting society, is, so far as cognitive skills are concerned, effectively prepared for adult life once a modest array of cognitive skills are acquired, as the example, at least, would indicate.[11] The equipment of the higher brain centers which underlies the development of these cognitive skills appears to have become adequately adapted, over the long stretch of human history, to the necessities of education for effective life in small hunting societies. This would seem indicated by the very ease with which these skills are acquired; they are not, on the face of it, "simple."

Our children become marvelously adept at these same cognitive skills at very tender ages. A child of three or four, simply by learning how accurately to use less than a dozen English words, comes to command, for one example, one very complex system of classes--namely his own kinship system; most preschool children can use these words (father, mother, brother, etc.) correctly, and, beyond that, can in their imagination take the position of the child next door ("Johnnie's sister") or any of several positions in a hypothetical family (as in playing house). In order to simulate with blocks the classification problem entailed in the American child's kinship system, one would have to provide an array of blocks having (at least) three colors, two sizes, two shapes, two textures (i.e. 24 different kinds of blocks and one or several of each), and the child would have to work simultaneously with all these attributes, using two three-dimensional matrices. A normal child of three or four usually can, in effect, handle this complex system of kinship classes, guided of course by the kinship vocabulary of his language. (But he cannot handle the blocks!)[12]

But what, of necessary cognitive skill, have we added to the child's educational burden in this last 1% of the human career? We have added, among other things, attribute blocks. I speak figuratively but seriously. The essential difference between handling the classification problem posed by the child's kinship system on the one hand, and handling the classification problem posed by an analogous set of attribute blocks on the other, is this. In the first case, kinship, the classes in question are named, each has a verbal label as "brother" stands for a class; the child, indeed, knows the verbal label first, and he gradually comes accurately to comprehend the class, as first he wrongly applies the

word "brother" to all children, perhaps then gradually learns the narrowed, correct meaning of the word. In the second case, attribute blocks, there are no prior verbal labels for the classes (only for the several attributes) and the child must comprehend any class without the help of language in that sense. When we ask a child to learn the complex classification system represented by his kinship, we ask him to learn the known, the already named. When we ask him to classify attribute blocks we ask him, in effect, to tackle the unknown, the not-yet named.

Probably, it is precisely in this realm that one encounters the basic contrast in the habitual cognitive processes of men in very small societies as against the cognitive skills needed, and enjoyed in varying degrees, by men in larger urban societies. In the finite world of small, closed communities, it would seem, virtually everything can be named--everything that could meet men's senses in any frequency has long met the senses of men, has been perceived in some accepted manner, and it would seem has received a name. Into such a universe of named things a child is born and in such a context he develops his cognitive abilities as those abilities are shaped by a universe of fully named parts.

To return to the hypothetical example of attribute blocks: if a man had paraded before him, serially, a set of blocks made up of two colors and two shapes--four kinds of blocks, what would he consciously know about those blocks after casual observation if, first, each of the four kinds had traditional, established names? and what would he know if the four kinds had no names? In the first case, it would seem, the man would be able later to recall that he had seen pass before him

blocks of those four named classes, and he might very well not be able to recall how many colors or how many shapes he had seen; in the later case he would be able to recall that he had seen pass blocks having two colors and having two shapes, but he would almost certainly be unable to recall whether all or only some of the possible combinations of shape and color had been paraded.[13]

History has, recognized or not, recently added the handling of attribute blocks to the child's educational burden. This began with cities and with the ever-increasing widening of horizons--new things, new peoples, new places--which came with cities. Very recent history has dramatically increased this same educational burden. For with science, our visions of the natural environment undergoes transformation every generation; with technology our social structure is subject to most drastic, continual transformation. The future is, quite unmistakably, unknown. That future is what the child-become-man will be living in. If every child is not educated to tackle the unknown he is today not educated. The absolute educational necessity of this cognitive skill, the necessity that all children acquire the skill or tangibly suffer in everyday life, is very new. For that reason alone there is some question as to how well some or all very young brains are equipped to handle attribute blocks, to tackle the unknown, the not-yet named.[14]

How long does the child have in which to learn? How many years are there in which to establish the fundamental mental habits the child will need as an adult? Grossly, so far as any formal schooling is concerned, the answer would seem to be six years, roughly from age three through age eight. Until a child emerges from the stage of toddler,

not much of a formal sort can be done (or is likely to be done), and psychologists and neurologists of various persuasions seem in rough agreement that, after about eight years, the basic orientation of a psyche becomes dramatically more difficult to change and that learning in general proceeds, after this age, at a much slower rate.

For a child born into a small hunting society, this brief period of ready educability would seem ample time for the learning he must accomplish. Such a child, long before the age of nine, in learning his language and through imitative play assisted by language, would seem to learn almost inevitably the basic cognitive skills (not the information) he will need as an adult--for example, the mental habits of verbally-assisted classification. The child's brief period of maximum educability, seen in this anthropological perspective, would seem to be the adequate results of a long process of biological adaptation, adequate for each new generation to learn what it needs to know to live in small, hunting societies.[15]

But, in this last 1% of human experience, with the coming of agriculture, then cities, then industrialization, and now the on-going revolutions in knowledge and technology, the child needs to learn, in addition, the habit of inquiry into the unknown--more than that, he needs the awareness of himself inquiring and needs some confidence in himself as inquirer. Evidently the serious beginnings of this additional learning must be fitted into those same six years, age three through eight--specifically to our immediate purposes, the primary years.

<u>To recapitulate</u>. Today's child, because he has little real opportunity to imitate in play the adult world, is to that degree forced to learn through verbally-transmitted information; perhaps the young child's

neurological equipment is adequate to this new manner of learning, perhaps not. At the same time he is required by circumstance to learn not only long-established cognitive skills, but in addition to learn the habit of inquiry as to the unknown; perhaps the young child's cognitive equipment is adequate for this new learning, perhaps not. Finally, it would appear that all this must be well under way during the brief years, age three through eight, the child's more formative years; perhaps that is adequate time, perhaps not.

Teachers, to hope to cope well with these very real strategic difficulties, will need the closest, concrete, up-to-the-minute information as to the child's cognitive development, will need the wherewithall not only to diagnose but to "teach" these, thus to move with sureness and dispatch as each child is able, hopefully to bring most children along and to turn over to fourth grade teachers finished adults, as it were, in the basic senses here treated.

This brief look at these neurological and cognitive facts, seen in anthropological perspective, perhaps gives to the facts an additional "toughness." We may be--bluntly--an animal imperfectly adapted to learn, in the way we must learn, what we must learn, when we must learn it. To live effectively with that possible fact will require the highest seriousness teachers and schools can muster.[16]

So much it seems possible to say. It again becomes necessary to turn to the teacher, to seek there cautious classroom applications of imperfect knowledge as it stands, thus to learn more. Specifically, earlier mentioned classroom experimentation in local schools promises to provide new information of interest and utility in these neurological and cognitive realms, as well as the realm of identity-development discussed above.

By the phrase neurological development we have referred, of course, to the array of matters bearing on the maturation and the trained development (purposeful or otherwise) of visual perception (near- and far-sightedness, dominance, tracking, etc.), to the analogous development of auditory perception, to the very intimately connected array of matters bearing on the maturation and training of motor habits (skills, balance, general motor orientation, etc.), and finally to the complex connections of all these with verbal skills. The ideas of the pediatrician Clement Papazian and others of his general orientation are familiar to educators in this region; these ideas have been taken up in local experimental use and carried into the classroom by teachers. I merely allude as an outside observer to these ideas and I hazard but one non-technical and altogether practical observation. It seems how realistically possible for any primary teacher to carry on a running, week-by-week preliminary neurological diagnosis of each child in a class and simultaneously to pursue, as appropriate for each normal child, a training program to nurture the child's neurological development; this in usual-sized classrooms, with realistically modest amounts of equipment and special preparation, and with quite modest amounts of on-going professional guidance and other assistance.

By cognitive development, we have referred to the thought of Piaget and of many influenced by him, as Bruner. The logical constructs of Piaget as to the child's "stages" of cognitive development are probably not adequate representations of much, even most, empirical reality, but to a teacher these formal constructs promise to make more intelligible the otherwise imponderable variety of any child's intellectual struggles with his world of facts and words and to make more nearly

intelligible the more formidable variety of such intellectual struggles by the several children in any primary class. An outsider may offer, again, only a very practical observation. Materials are becoming available which promise realistically to permit a primary teacher simultaneously to pursue on-going individualized diagnosis and individualized instruction in respect to the roughly sequential development of each child's thought processes. Experimental primary materials of this sort have been recently produced, jointly by the New York City Schools and Educational Testing Service; these too, are being taken by teachers into the local experimental classrooms.

* * *

Recent history has been rather hard on man, and very hard indeed on the schools. The impending transformations of human life may lead men out of the city-created maze, and that recent history, since men just gathered in cities, may someday be recognized as the brief interlude it probably is. Meanwhile men must survive, with whatever mental comfort they can find. To such hopes, not "solutions", these notions are briefly put down.

NOTES

1 An early version of this essay appears in the 1967 Proceedings of the Claremont Reading Conference. Certain passages are taken directly from that paper with minor editorial change, especially in the section on neurological and cognitive growth, and other passages are here included as footnotes.

2 This fact is importantly qualified among peoples who are unusually hard-pressed by the severity of their natural environs, as among Shoshoni-speaking Indian groups who lived and still live in the desert regions of Nevada and environs; there is, among such hard-pressed people, a great deal of nomadic movement, much catch-as-catch-can marriage among groups of different language and dialect, and the local group during great parts of the year is an isolated elementary family. It would seem to follow that homogeneity of mind would be much reduced in such contexts; in fact, the patterns of life among such people often have a degree of randomness, a certain "ad hoc" quality.

3 That is to say, any alien culture not imagined by the children, rightly or wrongly, to be represented in the classroom; in a classroom including Negro children, the study of an African people would, to these purposes, not be recommended, in these primary years. In the local experimental classrooms, the study of certain American Indians served well, but would not have so served a few miles away where classes include Indians.

4 Recent studies (in New York City) have indicated that the content of "readers," as to the presence or absence of interracial stories, makes no difference in the Negro child's achievement. To this writer the results of that study do not persuasively touch upon the matters here raised.

5 The allusion is to a "reader" especially prepared for this experimental class. Big Cat is an Indian boy.

6 We still speak figuratively; the actual cultural diversity of the classroom is broader; still, the addition of one more people, experienced by the children vicariously, tends to transform the climate of the class.

7 Extensive measurements by social psychologists were compiled during the 1966-67 year; these are currently being processed.

8 In the realm of practicality, two additional comments can be offered:
1) The third culture and the three R's.
It is evident that the child's world could not be transformed during the few minutes of the week normally allocated to "social studies." Studying a third culture means, to these purposes, taking over a very large proportion of the school day for at least two or three weeks at a time; the class must virtually immerse itself in the culture. This does not mean that the class drops reading, writing, arithmetic for the duration of the study. It does mean, however, that the class reads about, writes about, and perhaps adds Indians (or whomever).

That, in turn, means that the child at early stages of learning to read, needs primers and readers with appropriate content. The linguistic approach to reading makes this more readily possible, but teachers and schools have to write their own, for the here-and-now at least. Or the teacher can, not following the linguistic approach, simply have the children write their own books, as is often done.

2) A child's bridge to an alien culture.

The specific content of the study of a third culture must be such that the young child is given a meaningful bridge from his own experience to the world of Indians or whomever. Again, to quote from that early report of the local experimental program:

> [An Indian study] would, perhaps, because of the romance surrounding Indians, engage most children, at least briefly. [This] Indian study is, however, drawn so as to engage the child most seriously and over some duration. The study focusses on a realm of childhood experience that carries for every child a good deal of pleasure, a little pain and above all, a binding mystery--a realm of experience which, in a word, matters to a child. The curriculum focusses upon growing, growing as viewed from "underneath," as a child views it.
>
> Growing, to a child, involves more physical size, of course--little people and big people and little people becoming bigger. But growing, to a child, also involves another dimension about which most adults need occasionally to be reminded. An infant very early learns from parents the gross fact that he is a boy and she a girl. But beyond that, the infant and child faces the drawn-out and very difficult task of learning an array of often subtle things about how boys appropriately act; how, in contrast, girls appropriately act; how boys must anticipate becoming men and girls women, and so on. A difficult preoccupying task it is for the child. The array of "rules" is so very complicated that parents can convey only a few of the rules verbally; rather, most of the learning occurs as parents and others, without conscious thought and usually through cues rather than words, correct the child's behavior when the child chances to act counter to the rules. The child, in all this--in learning the difficult rules and acting out the appropriate part--finds pleasure, some pain, and always much mystery. It is a realm which preoccupies the child and deeply matters--he is discovering who he is....
>
> The main curriculum vehicle...is the story contained in Big Cat and its sequels, Big Cat's Wish, and Amity; through these books the instruction in reading at whatever level, is given, thus the stories receive long, close attention. The story is about a few moments of growing up, but about that as lived by an American Indian boy (specifically an Indian boy of the north-eastern states in the 1600's) and as viewed by his sister and parents. The boy Big Cat is discovering who he is and experiencing humnn pleasure, a little pain, and much mystery in that....

It is, of course, generally true that the mind of the child (and of the adult, too) can move only from the known to the new and unknown. The inference is often wrongly drawn that, since the concretely known for a young child is most often here and now, the young child's mind must move it from the known by small increments of spatial

distance and small increments of time. (Of course, insofar as we purposefully choose at some juncture to teach the children "space" and choose to teach "time," that perhaps is necessary.) But it does not seem that children especially care where dinosaurs were or precisely when they were, or care where or when Batman is or was. Many of those children know a great deal about both; they are not learning about time and space, but they are learning something of interest or fascination. Similarly, where Big Cat is and when he is, this is quite irrelevant to the purposes. Big Cat probably seems to the children suspended in time and space but it appears that that is a matter of no great concern to the child.

The bridges over which the child can get from his world of experience to that of another people are many, and among them, some one must be selected, with an eye to the educational purposes at hand. Peoples who are spatially remote or temporally remote are not necessarily experientially remote to a child; indeed such people probably seem less remote to a young child (who is incompletely socialized) than to his parent or teacher. About the third or fourth grade, however, children begin to be bothered by the "irrationality" of rain dances and the like; such strange behavior seems usually to strike younger children as a good idea.

9 In part this dependence on words is irreduceable, but only in part. It seems evident that greater, systematic use of play could be made in the schools. It would be quite impossible to show that urban children fare poorly in their general neurological development, relative to the children born into small societies. Pediatricians and schools are becoming increasingly aware of the neurological undevelopment of many children. Comparative psychology is building a fund of knowledge generally around the effects of use upon the growth of neurological networks. One study of members of a contemporary "small" community, the famous in-steel working Iroquois, sees earlier parallels to those contemporary abilities in that work and ascribes that to early forms of physical play. All this hardly begins to attend the problem, but all these facts are roughly consistent with what is asserted here: that children are newly handicapped by conditions of latter-day urban life.

10 A child born into a small society must, beyond this, come to command a special, common sort of inference--he must recognize the possibility of reading "clues" so that, from less than complete information he learns to attempt to infer the whole: tracks of a certain configuration imply the animal itself, or a certain item of adornment or demeanor implies a role, etc. This skill of implication, too, it would seem, is acquired very early, a rather direct and "natural" outgrowth of experience as that accumulates. (The child's powers of correct inference, of course, increase as experiences continue to accumulate, well into adult life.) Similarly, the child must learn inference by analogy; essentially this is a matter of simple inspection of sameness between classes of things, as a spotted illness may be seen as like a spotted animal and the two may be therefore associated; this skill too, seems to come to a child early and readily. There are, of course, other such cognitive skills required.

11 This is not, of course, to preclude the usual human incidence of genius in such societies; we are only dealing with the cognitive competence required for a successful life in such societies.

12 Similarly, a child today learns very early to infer by analogy, and a child learns to infer from incomplete facts, as a feather in the yard implies a bird (a very young child is likely, erroneously, to look up.)

13 We have embarrassingly little knowledge about the cognitive aspects of the mentality of men in small, closed societies. Gladwin has recorded that the men of Truk, who can perform prodigious feats of navigation solely by dead-reckoning, simply found it impossible to learn how to trouble-shoot a gasoline engine. It seems possible that that contrast in cognitive ability could be described in terms of facility with named classes of concrete entities as against lack of habitual facility in "thinking attributes." Such a contrast would be generally true, if at all, only if other things were always equal. Other things are not always equal. For example the grammar of Navaho forces all objects into two classes according to shape (as Spanish grammar forces all objects into two genders and English into three); it has been shown, fairly conclusively, that Navaho children who speak Navaho think readily in terms of the attribute "shape," while Navaho children who habitually speak English think "shape" less and think "color" more, when the two groups were asked to sort blocks. A key question would be, when the language spoken by a small community forces attention to some one attribute of named things, is there any diffuse effect toward creating facility with attributes in general?

14 We have similarly added yet another minimally necessary cognitive skill, a new, altogether necessary mode of inference beyond simple analogy and implication. This additional manner of inferring requires the learned ability to devise (or adopt) and apply abstract standards of measurement, as to length, volume, weight, etc., a skill not readily acquired by young children, as Piaget has shown, but a skill without which the merest beginnings of scientific investigation are impossible.

15 There is, of course, a great deal more to socialization than acquiring cognitive skills; we have not dealt with the affective domain, which has pre-empted virtually all the curiosity of anthropologists with psychological bent.

16 In the interests of pragmatic application, one observation:
If the strategic problem of teachers and schools has seemed difficult so far, it comes to appear doubly so when one thinks in addition, of reading.
We deal with the brief span of time, age three through eight. It would appear that almost no child of three is neurologically equipped to read normal printing at near-point; some few children appear scarcely ready at eight. Most children, one by one, become neurologically prepared in-between. If it were somehow possible to isolate reading from other pressing educational needs, the "safest" strategy, neurologically, would appear to be simply to delay reading until very late, say third grade.

Reading, however, is not isolatable in that sense. We said earlier that today's children must heavily depend on information that is verbally-transmitted. Add to that the fact that, having become a literate people, we as adults have become utterly dependent on the printed word. In non-literate societies including these small hunting societies we have discussed, every adult (or every male adult, or every female) is a story-teller and many adults are excellent story-tellers. Verbally-transmitted information or preachment is by these practiced raconteurs effectively relayed to children as the need requires or whim indicates. Among ourselves not one in fifty can hold a child's attention during a story (unless we are ourselves reading). In a word, until the child has access to the printed word, he is seriously cut-off from the world of verbal information around him. Add, finally, the fact that by the age of eight the child should have acquired not merely knowledge, but based on that, the habit of inquiry and some confidence in himself as inquirer. Each child, it is clear, should read at the moment he neurologically can read.

Fortunately a blanket, across-the-board rush is not necessary. Given current knowledge as to neurological and cognitive development, it would seem feasible that primary education can now become effectively individualized as each child's neurological and cognitive development unfolds. This applies quite practically to the teaching of reading, pre-kindergarten and up. A little ingenuity in reducing the near-point work in the early stages also helps.

There is, however, a second problem--a matter of limited hours and many tasks to get done. Time devoted to reading in primary classes is, given the still standard reading materials, time away from other educational tasks, which may be, as we saw, quite pressing. "Dick and Jane" and the sundry equivalents are hardly helping the child learn to inquire into known or the unknown.

Much has, of late, been written of "the linguistic approach." The anthropologist Henry Lee Smith is a leader in this direction. I add to the discussion one little-noted fact. The linguistic approach is dramatically liberating as to the <u>content</u> of primers and readers. By this linguistic approach the word, "pemican," for example, is very soon accessible to a child--that he perhaps never heard the word before is by this strategy, no matter, for its elements (as it happens) are "regular," and predictably he will readily read the word and come to learn its meaning. The linguistic approach allows the schools to make primers (and the time spent in reading) do double work, for it permits new content, selected with other purposes also in mind. The formidable educational tasks of the primary years would seem to require such double-duty, possibly to the mutual advantage of the several objectives, including the teaching of reading <u>per se</u>. "Readers" which teach only reading will soon be shown to be obsolete.

THE UNIVERSITY IN THE COMMUNITY: BACKGROUNDS AND PERSPECTIVES ON HIGHER ADULT EDUCATION

Ben Rothblatt
and
Sol Tax

The University of Chicago

April, 1967

University adult education in the United States has historically incorporated three major trends. One might be called "the pursuit of high culture," which characterized the early days of what came to be called "university extension." This movement flourished briefly in the 1890's, gave impetus to the initial rapid growth of extension, then declined, but has never died. The second centers around "the pursuit of vocational competence," which began with the revival of extension at the University of Wisconsin in 1906, characterized by a heavily vocational orientation and cooperative involvements between university extension divisions and business and industry. In university adult education alone, vocational courses still account for somewhere between one-third and one-half of all course enrollments.

The third and most recent trend might be called "the pursuit of social equilibrium" and involves thus far rather gingerly efforts to put university extension to work in "solving community problems." This trend, which at the moment includes programs under new federal legislation for what is coming to be called "urban extension," is not yet adequately reflected in enrollment statistics. Yet it is currently a major focus of deliberation and development within university extension circles and in government.

Both the vocational orientation and the new emphasis on social problems reflect a major shift from classical conceptions of the purposes of universities and share a concern for the satisfaction of national interests, on the one hand, in terms of meeting "manpower requirements" and, on the other, in the easing of "social frictions". Related to these developments is the growth of university extension as a national establishment devoted to the concept of "public service" in "the national interest", however these terms may be defined. The development of university extension in this direction is but one aspect of shifts in values and functions in American universities in general. For better or for worse, this development is likely to accelerate, and it raises issues and problems which the academic community must face and solve.

I

Universities grew up in the Middle Ages so that scholars might escape from the larger community and in mutual self-protection pursue goals which might run counter to the interests of the outer community; these goals reflected values and issued in practises essentially incompatible with participation in ordinary life. From the beginning the pursuit of truth and the sharing of knowledge generated counter pressures, but even the Medieval university took on social functions, such as the training of physicians, which to some degree mitigated hostile influences

and helped to guarantee its right to existence. Modern universities for the most part still adhere to the classical goals. Although the pursuit of truth has evolved into "the production of knowledge", it is customarily invoked, along with the dissemination of knowledge, as defining the purpose of contemporary universities.

As an institution whose primary functions are to produce and disseminate knowledge, the university has traditionally required a degree of autonomy not easily won and difficult to maintain in the face of constant pressures to change its values and to adopt other goals. The freedom to inquire and to teach require a kind of autonomy which society does not readily grant to its institutions, but which the university sees as an absolute necessity if it is to resist change which would ultimately subvert its primary functions. In Robert Maynard Hutchins' words: "External control by definition prevents universities from being centers of independent thought. By definition, if they are dominated by outside agencies or influences, they are not independent and can engage in independent thought only by sufferance. Such sufferance is likely to be short-lived in the absence of a clear understanding and a strong tradition supporting independent thought."[1] The absolute character of its requirements has led modern universities to develop as organizations with a variety of characteristics which are strikingly differentiated from other complex organizations. It is not surprising, therefore, that the university, as a community, has

traditionally had problems both delicate and unique in its external relations with the outer community.

The university, existing in a society to whom its primary goals are a matter of indifference, if not hostility, has reacted in a variety of ways. Society appears to require of the university that it pursue its unique purposes in the service of the general goals of the larger community, or that it at least justify its functions in terms of some concept of public service. One university response has been to devise what might be called a rhetoric of "service in the long run". This is the attempt to rationalize the work of the university in terms of the broadest and most general goals of society and is expressed in a rhetoric that is both hortatory and evangelistic, though not necessarily false. Thus "the truth makes men free" and therefore the institution whose function is the pursuit of truth is engaged in the noblest work of free men in a democracy. A somewhat less general version argues that scientific knowledge is the foundation for all progress, material and otherwise, and therefore ultimately provides the means for "the good life." On this view, the university performs a service by fulfilling its primary functions, and no special activities of other kinds are required.

"Service in the short" run involves more than rhetoric. It commits the university to extending its resources to the community, either by granting various kinds of limited membership in the university

community to outsiders, or by directing a portion of its resources to the solution of community problems. A full commitment to service on the part of the university goes far beyond this. In extreme cases it involves the adoption by the university of society's goals as primary and the subordination or the denial of its own goals. It is this view of service which has gained increasing influence in most of our universities and has become the dominant ideology in some.

The production of knowledge and its dissemination are thus justified, when justification seems necessary, on the basis of one or both of two propositions. On the one hand, knowledge is said to be intrinsically worthwhile and to provide its own justification; on the other hand knowledge is justified on the principle of its social utility, whether immediate or remote. Over the last century in American higher education, however, the principle of utility has to a considerable degree emerged as a concept distinct from both the pursuit and the dissemination of knowledge, representing a third and independent goal and a separate set of functions. This relatively new area of university activity generally goes by the name of "public service." The term itself is ambiguous. It has been used to cover such diverse activities as certain kinds of government-sponsored research, professional training of various sorts; technical assistance and in some cases direct intervention in the affairs of communities around the world, even performance of quasi-

military functions under the guise of foreign educational missions. For the most part, however, the term is most commonly used to refer to the wide and somewhat bizarre variety of activities conducted under the rubric of university extension divisions. These include the university teaching of adults at a variety of levels and by various means, but they also range from the sponsorship of 4-H clubs to the operation of radio and television facilities to the organization of international scholarly conferences. Despite the bewildering assortment most public service functions are, in fact, simply teaching and many involve research. But they are viewed as teaching and research of a special kind which requires justification in terms of short-run utility rather than on the basis of intrinsic value. Ancillary to what are regarded as the primary scholarly functions of the university, they are grouped under a rubric with a decidedly pejorative flavor. It is these activities which have come to characterize the service-oriented university.

The service orientation in American higher education burst into flower about a century ago. Its first major expression was the land grant college, established by the Morrill Act in 1862 to promote teaching "related to agriculture and the mechanic arts." Although the land grant colleges were founded in response to genuine needs, they also reflected a popular antipathy to higher education undergirded by a pervasive anti-intellectualism. This was most clearly evident in

the anti-university activities of such pressure groups as the Grange. In part such popular opposition to higher education was justified by the manifest inadequacies of the mid-nineteenth century colleges. Their resistance to change made the creation of new institutions mandatory.

As Lawrence Veysey has recently shown, the temporary alienation of American higher education from the public in the two decades following the Civil War had important consequences. It led to the appearance of the public-relations-minded university executive who involved his institution in political maneuvering and actively pursued public favor and private money. At the same time it attracted to the universities alienated intellectuals who saw the gap between the university and the public as a positive advantage.[2] Some of the latter, like Veblen, would inevitably collide with the new breed of university administrators, whom he named "captains of erudition". The essential incompatibility of both people and ideologies within the university helped to generate internal competition and conflict and hastened the development of such pluralistic solutions as the "multi-purpose university".

Until extension became a part of the formal structure of universities in the latter part of the nineteenth century, adult education activities on the university level had consisted in sporadic ventures by regular

faculty into the outer community. Such excursions were discretionary with the individual professor; they were not regarded as a professorial duty or as a special obligation of the university. With the growth of the service concept and the entry of extension into the formal organization of universities, the instruction of adults became a recognized obligation, and a cluster of vexing problems arose: Who shall teach extension courses? How shall they be financed? What should be the proper relationship between extension teaching and the regular teaching of the university? None of these problems has yet been solved.

The range of problems involved in the university's total response to the community have been acted out on a smaller stage in the history of university extension. Decisions made at the time of extensions' origins and for the most part followed through its history have generated a set of persistent problems. The often uneasy relationships between extension divisions and their parent universities is reflected in perennial questions about the quality of extension work and the marginality of its organization rooted in these classical decisions. One was the decision that extension work should be self-supporting. The other was the organization of extension with faculties separate from those of the central universities. Both decisions reflect an ambivalence about extension present from the start, rooted in confusions inherent in the concept of public service. In the process of relating the university to the community, University Extension

grew closer to the community than to the University itself.

II

Organized university adult education sprang from a variety of sources. Borrowing the name "University Extension" from its English models, it took over as well the concept of providing education beyond the university's walls to those who had missed opportunities for university study but retained an appetite for knowledge and a yearning for high culture. "The great object of Extension," Richard Storr has noted, "was the cultural redemption of America."[3]

Extension grew rapidly in the 1890's at the same time as American colleges suddenly became universities, expanding their purposes and proliferating their functions. Adopting the English version of the lecture course as its basic format, American university extension spread rapidly across the country, then, before its first decade had ended, suddenly declined. When it revived, a few years later, it was animated by the new and indigenous conception, public service, and took on additional functions not limited to the cultural enrichment of individual adults.

Planning the first organized extension division in an American university in 1891, William Rainey Harper began with the notion that extension should be a regular function of the new University of Chicago. The reasons for this decision are somewhat obscure. Certainly Harper genuinely believed in the value of adult education. He had invented

correspondence study while at Chatauqua and later as a university president continued to teach Hebrew by mail. In addition he was familiar with, and respected, the extension work that was being done by English universities. As a shrewd administrator he was perhaps aware, as well, of the possibilities which a vast network of extension lecturers presented for quickly establishing the name of the new university. The flavor of Harper's ambivalence about the purposes of extension is captured in the following statement, written before the new university opened:

> To provide instruction for those who for social or economic reasons cannot attend its classes is a legitimate and necessary part of the work of every university. To make no effort in this direction is to neglect a promising opportunity for building up the university itself, and at the same time to fall short of performing a duty which from the very necessities of the case is incumbent upon the University. It is conceded by all that certain intellectual work among the people at large is desirable; those who believe in the wide diffusion of knowledge regard it as necessary; all are pleased to see that it is demanded. This work, while it must be in a good sense popular, must also be systematic in form and scientific in spirit; and to be such it must be done under the direction of a university, by men who have had scientific training. For the sake of the work it should in every instance come directly from the university, that thus (1) there may be a proper guarantee of its quality; (2) character may be given it; (3) continuity may be assured; (4) suitable credit may be accorded. The doing of the work by the university will (1) do much to break down the prejudice which so widely prevails against an educated aristocracy; (2) give to a great constituency that which is their right and due; (3) establish influences from which much may be expected directly for the university; (4) bring inspiration to both professor and pupil in college and university; (5) bring the university into direct contact with human life and activity.[4]

Extension was thus launched as a formal, and presumably coordinate, division of the new University of Chicago. At the same time it began with a special faculty whose duties and status removed it from the central faculty. Extension was established as a central function of the university, but not as a function of its central faculty.

The separation of the extension faculty was geographical as well as spiritual. Richard Moulton, the most popular of the special extension lecturers, had been imported by Harper from Cambridge. Normally Moulton spent twelve hours a week on the lecture platform and at least twenty-eight hours on the road, writing his lectures in hotels, on trains, and at rural lunch counters. In 1895 he wrote Harper: "The strain is becoming intolerable; and I am fit for nothing but the routine and hardly for that....I feel like breaking down already ....I have...been as much shut out of the social life of the University as if I were an agent abroad...."[5]

Following Chicago, the second major pattern for University Extension was established at the University of Wisconsin. At first the efforts were ad hoc, following the English pattern of the lecture series. In 1890, for example, Frederick Jackson Turner presented a series on North American Colonization. Soon President Thomas C. Chamberlin, like Harper, saw possibilities in extension as a means of public relations and recruitment for the university. In the early 1890's,

therefore, faculty members were encouraged to give lecture courses in outlying areas, although they were restricted to week-end appearances. The railroads cooperated by giving them special rates. In 1896, again following Harper, Wisconsin began correspondence study on a small scale.

As at Chicago and elsewhere, Wisconsin's extension lecture courses on university subject-matter flourished briefly, then declined. Extension was revived in 1906 only after the "cultural" approach was dropped. The new orientation had been foreshadowed in 1901 by the introduction of courses for electric and steam plan managers. When Charles Van Hise was inaugurated as president of the University of Wisconsin in 1904, he declared his general intention of extending its scope, and two years later announced that the revival of university extension was part of his plan. In the interim, although both the faculty and the general public apparently lost interest in general education by means of lecture-courses, new interests had made themselves known from the external community, principally from manufacturers and merchants. The revived extension responded to these interest groups by placing its emphasis on engineering and hiring as its first dean, Louis E. Reber, former engineering dean at Pennsylvania State College. As extension thrived under Van Hise and Reber, its work was carried on by a new faculty, separate, and lower in status than the central faculty.[6]

The patterns at both Chicago and Wisconsin began with certain similarities. At both institutions extension originally developed as a means of formalizing and regularizing the University's the University's teaching role outside the university community, in an attempt to systematize and expand faculty interest which had hitherto been largely voluntary. The values which initially underlay these efforts were egalitarian and humanistic, although, as in other colonial ventures, mixed with considerations of self-interest. As extension became regularized and institutionalized, these functions were removed from the faculty and placed under the control of full-time bureaucrats. At Chicago the emphasis on academic subject-matter was never given up and extension eventually found its way back to the faculty. But at Wisconsin the original concept of service which had involved extending the university's resources for the benefit of individual adults was replaced by a notion of service whose object was groups in the community, groups with "needs" which the university must "meet". As extension became service-oriented in the direction of interest groups, rather than individuals, a mass base was created which took extension out of the hands of the faculty and placed it under the control of administrators who could identify with interest groups in the community and, who, in turn, created special curricula and a special faculty whose primary allegiances belonged to its new clientele. University Extension in turning away from the early model and from its English influence, in the process

moved away from the central university itself. Wisconsin's pattern became the new model for university extension in the United States, and, although a significant minority has gone in other directions and adopted other styles, it remains the basic model into the nineteen-sixties.

III

University Extension today is only one segment of a large adult education establishment in the United States. Estimates of the numbers of adults engaged in formal study range from 25 to 50 million. The most recent and most comprehensive study reports that about 25 million American adults were involved in some form of systematic study in the year ending in June, 1962. This number includes about two and one-half million full-time students.[7] The same study shows that over 2.6 million adults were enrolled as part-time or extension students in universities and colleges, nearly 3.5 million course enrollments. Twenty-one per-cent of adult education courses were offered by universities and colleges. Enrollment data from the two major university extension organizations report over 4 million course enrollments for 1965-1966.[8]

The data clearly show that the orientation of university extension is still heavily vocational. In 1965-1966, slightly less than half of extension enrollments were in the sciences, social sciences, and the humanities. The majority (52.7%) were in agriculture, business, education, engineering and other professional and vocational categories.[9] An

earlier and less comprehensive survey showed that "professional and technical" courses were nearly twice as numerous as "arts and sciences" courses.[10] (~~Morton~~) University extension appears to be even more vocationally oriented than adult education in general; the Johnstone survey estimates that only 32% of all adult education courses are vocational.[11]

Thus, although vestiges of the early cultural orientation remain, the shift toward utilitarian ends which marked the revival of university extension at Wisconsin has been the dominant element in the rapid growth of university adult education. In addition to its dominance of so-called "general extension," the utilitarian emphasis is at the heart of the agricultural extension movement through most of its history and is reflected as well in the growth of urban evening colleges which began in the nineteen-thirties. For although evening colleges have traditionally offered standard university credit courses for part-time students, their emphasis has been on undergraduate degree programs, especially in the "practical" disciplines.

The emphasis on training adults for vocational competence has at its basis the objective of helping to stock the manpower pool with varieties of workers in a range of categories. The policy statement of the National University Extension Association puts it as follows: "In all fields, the rapid accumulation of knowledge gives the alert professional man or woman no alternative but to continue his or her education.

Accountants, lawyers, journalists, artists, teachers, industrial managers, doctors, agriculturists, chemists, engineers--all professional people --must go on for further education if they are to serve as effective members of their professions. If our economy is to maintain dynamic growth, the findings of on-going research must be made available in the form of post-graduate training. . . . As important as this professional retraining has been in the past in most extension divisions, more must be done in the future."[12] The point is stated somewhat more bluntly by John Gardner in the forward to a volume celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of The National University Extension Association. "Our aim is to educate and re-educate for participation in the world of work. . . . Our complex society cannot survive without a high percentage of able and educated people who keep their skills abreast of the times."[13]

From this point of view it is a short step to the enlargement of the service function to other kinds of programs "in the national interest." In large part this is a response to new demands by the federal government, accompanied by the government's willingness to pay for such service. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorized $10 million for "community service programs...designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems....where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university

extension or continuing education courses...."[14]

In the turn toward community service, the vocational orientation has not been left behind. In the first year of Title I programs, 26% of funds appropriated were spent on in-service training for government personnel at the state and local levels--the largest single category of expenditure. This involved a total of 160 projects, conducted by 95 colleges and universities, more than a third of which were "government operations" courses, such as "management techniques" for supervisors, refresher courses for government accountants, and budgeting for fiscal officers.[15]

Recognizing its opportunities, the National University Extension Association has rapidly mobilized itself to provide service and to solicit new demands. Organized in 1915, the Association had as its charter members four private universities, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, and Pennsylvania, as well as 18 state universities. In 1965, with the passage of Title I, and now grown to a membership of over a hundred universities, it established a secretariat in Washington with a full-time executive director and staff which negotiates contracts on a national scale with the Federal Government and sends out a steady barrage of lobbying directives to its member deans.

In responding to these new demands, university extension may be simply following the new mood of American higher education in general,

as expressed by Clark Kerr: "Today, more than ever, education is inextricably involved in the quality of a nation. And the university, in particular, has become in America, and in other nations as well, a prime instrument of national purpose. This is new. This is the essence of the transformation now engulfing our universities."[16] Along with the ascendance of the service concept comes explicit recognition of the potential of university extension for responding quickly and efficiently to demands for service. Kerr goes on to say: "Extension divisions are proving to be increasingly effective administrative devices for linking campus and community in the further pursuit of knowledge. Freer of traditions and rules than regular university academic departments, extension units can respond quickly and in a variety of patterns to meet society's needs for current information and training."[17]

Universities have contributed to the need for extension services simply by fulfilling their primary functions, that is, by adding to knowledge and by educating increasing numbers of youth. The accelerated production of knowledge makes continuing education a necessity, and the rising level of education swells the group who are the prime candidates for further education, as the Johnstone study shows, and who are most likely to demand that universities meet their needs. As such pressures increase it is unlikely that universities will be able to

7

ignore them, even if they want to. The probability is, therefore, that universities will continue to change in the direction of increasing involvement in extension work. As the Johnstone report says: "The most important conclusion to be derived from the study is that America is likely to experience an adult education explosion during the next few decades. The typical adult student is young, urban, and fairly well-educated, and this is exactly the type of person who will be around in greatly increased numbers in the very near future."[18]

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as well as other recent federal legislation, has opened the way for some universities to take their first plunge into extension work and for others to expand their activities. Yet it is clear that extension, despite a growing sense of obligation, intensified community pressures, and new financial incentives, can never become a primary function of universities. On the other hand continued growth in the scope and importance of extension activities is virtually certain. The problem for universities, therefore, is the direction of their response. How can they expand extension activities, at the same time relating them more closely to the central functions of the university and to its central faculty?

In general universities have traditionally followed one or the other of two major directions in the organization and administration of their extension activities. These may be characterized as, on the one hand, a "faculty-oriented" approach and a "community-oriented" approach,

on the other. The first regards extension as a function of its central faculty, and the character and style of extension activities are determined by the interests and commitments of that faculty. The alternative approach takes the "needs" of the community as primary and developes activities designed to meet those needs, whether or not these activities are carried on by the regular faculty.

Beginning with Harper, universities have for the most part adopted the second alternative and employed a separate faculty to carry out extension work. Data on this question are hard to come by. One recent survey of 95 evening colleges reports that 59 evening colleges staffed their credit courses using less than 60% regular faculty.[19] Another survey which took a sample of small universities (less than 4,000 students) shows that part-time teachers make up about 39% of the total teaching staffs.[20] A random glance at university extension catalogs bears out the fact that the involvement of regular faculty is not great. For example, at the University of California (Berkeley) in Spring, 1967, about 10% (31) of the 301 instructors listed are regular faculty members (including lecturers) and another 10% (29) are university staff members without faculty rank.

The creation of a separate faculty for extension work guarantees the marginality of university adult education. A separate faculty, by accident or by design, is a group without power in the university. Usually

it is a part-time faculty whose members have primary commitments elsewhere. Since neither extension faculty nor extension students are full members of the university community, it is certain that not too much importance will be attached to extension work. With this system a university is able to satisfy to a degree an outside constituency at the same time keeping the whole enterprise at arm's length.

Professionals in adult education have contributed to this marginality by overemphasizing the distinctness of extension from the normal teaching and research functions of the university. Stressing the differences between the adult learner and others, as well as differences in life patterns and learning situations, they have tended to play down similarities. In addition they have by and large advocated separate administrative structures on the grounds of differences in goals and functions. They have been more than willing on the whole to allow extension activities to go under the name of "service", even when they were simply teaching and research, fundamentally no different from the main business of higher education.

For the university the chief advantage of a part-time extension faculty is, in addition to the obviously lower cost, the vesting of authority in the administrative apparatus, with the accompanying flexibility, adaptability, and speed in the decision process. Of course, this is also a central disadvantage.

Faculty control, on the other hand, appears to have a number of advantages, among them the following: only faculty control can relate extension to the primary functions of the university, determining its proper place in an order of priorities. Otherwise it becomes a competitive function and produces conflict. Faculty participation can become a voluntary activity, stemming from genuine interest rather than from bribery or coercion. Control and participation by the central faculty guarantees standards and sets norms for "university-level" work, eliminating troublesome debates which have historically focussed on this issue. Academic decisions are thus made by those best qualified to make them. In a faculty-oriented extension arrangement, extension is a literal extension of the central university; but this is also true in reverse. The input of the outer community operates directly on the central university with benefits for the faculty as well as for the community. The community can directly influence the work of the faculty in terms of research, experimentation, and publication, and exposure to mature students, free of some of the less desirable attributes of the full-time student, may operate to improve teaching.

In a university in which extension is a responsibility of the central faculty and under its control some of the problems which are characteristic of service-oriented organizations do not arise. Perhaps chief among them is the problem of legitimation. Service functions are legitimized solely on

the grounds that the faculty chooses to perform them. Those extension activities which the faculty chooses to perform are those likely to reflect most closely their scholarly interests and in fact to reinforce them, that is, those related to research efforts, which contribute to the clarification of issues and theories, or, more crassly, those which might culminate in scholarly publication.

Faculty-oriented extension in a university is likely to entail the following structural consequences: 1) Some formalized means of direct faculty control over extension functions is provided. 2) Public service functions tend to be decentralized. No single extension unit is permitted to consolidate all service functions and become a powerful force in possible opposition to the faculty. 3) As a consequence whatever central extension unit may exist tends to be weak and to have sharply limited powers. 4) Public service activities tend to be somewhat ad hoc. Large scale and long term commitments to specific programs are avoided. This limitation on the scope and continuity of public service commitments may also constitute a serious disadvantage inherent in faculty-oriented organization. To the degree that programs depend on the interests and inclinations of individual faculty members at specific times essentially of their own choosing, the difficulties of offering a stable range of activities are increased and may even become unmanageable. However, an extension organization can overcome these difficulties if its power is based in the

faculty and if it shares faculty values.

IV

It is a commonplace that technological advances have produced both the conditions which make continued education necessary and the leisure which makes it possible. At the same time accelerated technological and social change have enlarged the university's role as a center of influence, more available, for better or for worse, to take on action roles and problem-solving functions. The American university appears to be in the midst of another period of rapid development paralleling the period of ferment in the late 19th century which transformed the college into the modern university. Part of the new transformation involves the expansion of the university's public service function, whether carried on by formal extension divisions or not. Along with the university as a whole, the emphasis of extension as an organized movement has become ever more concerned with programs "in the national interest". Although earlier goals, cultural enrichment and vocational competence, have never been abandoned, the current thrust of university extension is toward its functioning as a useful corrective for economic and social dysfunctions.

If the dangers of this development are to be avoided and its possibilities realized, it must be integrated into the central core of the universities and must be controlled by the members of the academic

community itself. Although academics are no more competent than anyone else to determine the public interest or to establish national goals, they must be free to decide the degree and the manner in which universities shall respond to national needs, whatever they may be. They do so by deciding, as individuals, the character and direction of their own responses.

In doing so they must face not only the administrative problems described, and personal problems of their own commitment, but a very real intellectual and moral dilemma. Reference has already been made to the University as a colonizer in the mass society surrounding it. By the same token the academic community finds itself in a situation similar to that of the members of a minority culture in the process of "incorporation" by the majority culture. As the marks of difference distinguishing the university from the community at large are diminished and as allegiances with the national community are simultaneously reinforced, the values supporting the university's existence as a discrete sub-culture are threatened. The obvious danger is that the distinctive values which the academic community finds necessary to fulfill its goals will be impossible to maintain.

One method the university has available to it as a counter-measure is the diffusion of its own values in the outer community, broadening its base and, in effect, subverting those more generally shared values of the

majority culture which constitute a threat. To the degree that university education is made increasingly available to adults, as well as to youth, these opportunities are maximized. In fact, this is what is taking place today. But as the university extends its influence there is some question as to whether it is "undermining" community values, or whether the reverse is the case.

Any such struggle implies the issue of whether an intellectual elite can justify forcing its values on a perhaps unwilling society, even if it could. Indeed, to the degree that a faculty resists providing specific services on demand, and is reduced -- or elevated -- to providing "education" to adults (as distinguished from younger candidates for degrees) it faces what may become its most difficult dilemma.

Anthropologists agree that education of the young is socialization, a process in which tradition and the general cultural heritage are transmitted in linear fashion from each generation to the succeeding one. Higher education is, in a sense, cross-cultural, As we shift from primary and secondary to higher education socialization begins to take a peculiar turn. The tradition passed along is in many respects no longer the general tradition, but is rather the "tribal wisdom" of the academic, which members of that sub-culture are attempting to sustain and diffuse to the majority culture. For the most part the national state is willing to overlook such subversion as long as it is outweighed by more functional

contributions, as in the training for vocations and professions. When the university turns to adult or "continuing" general education, however, the problem of whose culture shall be transmitted becomes acute. In the new multi-tribal nations (as in the older colonial situations) the problem is critical. In the United States it may become more vital as such education becomes less sporadic and voluntary and more centralized and necessary.

REFERENCES

1. "Education and Independent Thought" in Freedom, Education, and the Fund (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), p. 155.

2. Lawrence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965).

3. Richard J. Storr, Harper's University: The Beginnings (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 197.

4. Quoted in A Conspectus to the Self-Study Project of University College, The University of Chicago ed. Robert M. Roth (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1964), p. 8.

5. Quoted in Betty F. Heycke A History of the Origins of Adult Education at The University of Chicago, unpublished M.S. in possession of the author, p. 11.

6. Frederick M. Rosentreter, The Boundaries of the Campus (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957).

7. John W.C. Johnstone and Ramon J. Rivera, Volunteers for Learning (Chicago: Aldine Press, 1965), p. 1.

8. Programs and Registrations 1965-66, Association of University Evening Colleges and the National University Extension, undated.

9. ibid.

10. John R. Morton, University Extension in the United States (Birmingham: The University of Alabama Press, 1953) Chap. 9.

11. Johnstone and Rivera, op. cit., p. 2.

12. National University Extension Association, Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting, v. 44, Santa Barbara, 1961, p. 21 italus added.

13. Expanding Horizons: Continuing Education, ed. Stanley J. Drazek, et. al. (Washington, D.C.: National University Extension Association, 1965) p. vii.

14. U.S. Congress, Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, 89th Congress, 1965.

15. Community Service and Continuing Education, mimeo newsletter published by the Division of Adult Education Programs, U.S. Office of Education /Sept.-Oct. 1966/.

16. "The Frantic Race to Remain Contemporary", Daedalus, vol. 93 (Fall, 1964), p. 1051-52.

17. ibid., p. 1060.

18. Johnstone and Rivera, op. cit., p. 19.

19. Roger DeCrow, Administrative Practices in University Evening Colleges (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962), p. 37.

20. D.B. Gowin with George H. Daigneault, The Part-Time College Teacher (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961), p. 1.

21. See Sol Tax, "The Education of Underprivileged Peoples in Dependent Territories", Journal of Negro Education, XV (Summer, 1946).

THE INTERPLAY OF FORCES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEM[1]

Donald Horton

Bank Street College of Education

Members of the mental health professions and social scientists concerned with the role of the school in social welfare would probably agree that there is a scarcity of research designed to orient us to the structure and operations of the public schools. Most of us have some acquaintance with the schools from having been through them ourselves or perhaps from helping to steer our children through them, and this may be useful to us on occasion; but our recollections concern individual schools, not school systems, and it is the system that we usually have to deal with when we are proposing new educational or mental health programs or undertaking extensive research in the educational field. Then we not only need to know something about the structure of the system, which is of course much more complicated than that of a single school, but also to arrive quickly at some understanding of the dynamics of the system, of the changes that are going on and the direction in which the system is moving. For this we need the aid of a conceptual model or, more likely, a number of models for different kinds of systems. The present paper represents the first stage of an attempt to develop such a model on the basis of a study of a suburban school system. The field-work was carried on during the years 1961 and 1962, and was supplemented by some research on the previous history of the system and occasional contacts since that time.[2]

---

1. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Washington, D.C., March 1967.

2. The study was conducted mainly through participant observation and interview. It was part of the Schools and Mental Health Program of Bank Street College of Education supported by grant 3M-9135 from the National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Public Health Service.

Within the limits of a short paper I can introduce the subject only in outline, an outer frame of reference to be filled in in later publications. The course of the system will here be described in gross terms as a product of transactions among and within four powers: the school system itself, the local community, government, and the educational world. Since the base is a single case-study, my presentation will consist partly of an abbreviated account of actual events, arranged to suggest general processes, and partly of generalizations from these data where I feel that established theory or common knowledge would justify it.

The Community and School System of Brookview

The public school system referred to serves a suburban, residential community of more than 30,000 and less than 50,000 population in the New York area. It will be called Brookview in this discussion. The system was chosen for our research not because it was considered to be representative of all systems of this size, but because it was reputed to be a "good" system, well-supported by a community of moderate means, and was therefore judged to be a favorable location for certain educational innovations to be introduced in one of its schools by other members of the Bank Street College staff.[3]

For present purposes, the most significant demographic facts about the community are that its population is rather evenly divided between blue-collar and white-collar families; the class spread is narrow -- there are few very rich or very poor families and the average income is close to the county median. Catholics, Jews and Protestants each constituted about a third of the population in 1960-61. A majority of the Catholic children attended parochial

---

3. The sociological study on which the present paper is based was intended to provide a perspective on the structure and dynamics of the system for the participants in the educational project. Invaluable assistance in the field study was given by Mr. Harry Gracey and Miss June Greenlief and, in the analysis of data, by Miss Carla Drije.

elementary schools, but went on to the public high school. The number of Negroes in the community was insignificant. Tensions associated with class, religious and ethnic differences operated within the Brookview community and school system, but the problem of racial integration had not begun to arise.

The population of Brookview had been expanding rapidly since the middle forties; by 1961 it had nearly reached the limit set by available land, given the prevailing custom of building single family houses on individual plots. In the decade from 1950 to 1960, as the population increased, there were upward shifts in the medians of age, education and income.[4] There is some evidence that the Jewish population increased more than the Catholic and Protestant populations during the decade. The town was becoming larger, more middle class, more prosperous, older and more Jewish. These and related changes contributed to the kinds and energies of the demands made upon the educational system by community groups.

The Brookview public school system consists of several elementary schools, two junior high schools, a comprehensive high school, a central administrative office and a nine-member board of education. Three board members are elected each year for a three-year term. School budgets and bond issues are submitted to the electorate for approval.[5]

---

4. Comparison of the census figures for 1950 and 1960 shows a higher proportion of college graduates (up 18 per cent) and fewer with eighth grade or less education (down 25 per cent), a 29 per cent increase in the number of persons 65 or over, and an increase in families with incomes of $10,000 from less than 10 per cent to nearly 35 per cent of all families.

5. It should be said that this degree of citizen participation in school affairs is not typical for the country as a whole. Although election of board members is common, occurring in 87 per cent of all systems, according to the N.E.A. (National Education Association, Research Bulletin, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, April, 1950, p. 58; and see also NEA Research Memo, 1966-19, August, 1966), only 28 per cent submit the budget to the electorate (13 per cent in a town meeting, and 15 per cent by ballot). It may be presumed that in other kinds of systems the forces we are concerned with operate in other and less public ways.

The Dynamics of the School System; Transaction and Compromise

I have suggested that the development of a school system (that is, an American public school system in the 1960's) can be understood as a product of its transactions with the local community, the educational world, and government agencies. In a transactional model, of course, each of the tributary systems is subject to a similar analysis and it is only by arbitrary choice and simplification that we describe the internal structure and dynamics of one as an integral system, while treating the others only in their partial connections with it. In this perspective, the object system is seen as a self-directed and self-motivated organization whose course of development is influenced in various ways through its interdependence with the external world.

It is a familiar observation that organizational personnel tend to defend their organization against demands for change made by "outsiders." They develop an internal program and mechanism of regulated change which is to some degree autonomous. They try especially to initiate and regulate in their own interest changes in such definitions of the aims and functions of the organization as may be required by changes in environing systems and to devise and control the structural innovations that may be called for by changed functions. In school systems the critical processes of developmental control include the reformulation of educational goals, planning for curriculum innovation, "staff development," etc., and these self-steering processes are protected by claims of professional authority, colleague solidarity, rejection of lay "interference" and other defensive mechanisms.

On the other hand, the school system, like other organizations, may be subject to coercion by external agencies such as the legislature and the courts which may impose unwanted regulations and obligations, against which

the defense mechanisms are ineffective, especially since the school system is itself, legally, an instrument of the state government.

Between the poles of completely autonomous and coerced change (both of which may be more theoretical than actual) lies a wide zone in which proposed changes are negotiated between the personnel of the system and the spokesmen of external groups, particularly those of the local community, whose financial, technical and political cooperation is needed to keep the system in action. The structural changes that are agreed ~~to~~ upon represent compromises between the demands of the staff, following the logic of their own system, and the demands of the outside agents. No doubt there is great variation in the extent to which compromises involved in organizational change involve conflict and the reconciliation of contrary interests, but conflict is so pervasive that it seems justifiable to assert that organizational change typically includes a political element. Political processes are as characteristic of the internal dynamics of the organization as of its interchanges with the milieu; what we have called autonomous change may involve an intra-organizational form of "change politics." In a more developed model, the relations between the internal and external politics of organizational change would be considered; however, in this paper I wish to view the development of the Brookview system in the large, as a product of the transactions in which its own program of development is modified in response to the demands of community groups, governmental agencies and educational organizations. I shall have to disregard the internal processes through which the policies and strategies of the school system itself were arrived at.

Tendencies in the Development of the Brookview School System

As one looks at the development of the Brookview system, it is apparent that four basic trends can be differentiated: (1) an enlargement in size,

(2) an elaboration of structure and functions, (3) an intensification of the basic educational work, and (4) an upgrading of positions. By enlargement I mean an increase in the numbers of schools and other facilities and in number of employees; by elaboration an increase in the variety of positions and units within the organization, accompanying further differentiations of tasks and functions; by intensification changes in task performance that are regarded by the personnel themselves as "improvements" or "enrichments" of performance, but which might be defined neutrally as representing an increase in the demands made upon pupils and teachers -- demands for more work, at more sophisticated levels, at earlier ages, for example; and by upgrading of positions is meant attributing professional status to them, increasing the degree of autonomy in work allowed them, increasing remuneration, etc. All four tendencies as described here involve expansion in some sense.

These exapnsionist forms of development follow consistently from the logic of the system itself:

Enlargement is a necessary response of the organization to increasing pupil population. During the period from the mid-forties to 1960, for example, the people of Brookview invested approximately nine milli.. dollars in new school buildings and equipment. A concomitant increase in staff and materials was reflected (along with the effects of inflation during those years) in an increase in the annual school budget from half a million dollars to four millions. Elaboration of structure and intensification of activities both appear to follow from two principles, one ideological and the other organizational. Ideologically, the Brookview system is committed to a highly individualistic form of education, in which a unique pattern of "developmental needs" is postulated for each child and it is believed that the educational process should be adjusted to this pattern in such a way as to "maximize" each child's

"learning potential" and "creativity." This aim is far from being achieved, but the educators press towards its accomplishment. The ideology of extreme individualism implies an ever-decreasing class-size and increased provision for tutorial relations and practices, with an accompanying increase in the ratio of teachers to pupils (although the optimum conditions are not known).[6] There is also implied a correlative increase in individual psychological testing and in counselling or therapy; a higher minimum level of educational training and psychological sophistication of teachers; a premium upon graduate training and continued in-service training; and a demand for experimentation with new contents and new forms of the educational enterprise.

The organizational principle to which the system responds is that of occupational specialization. When specialists are introduced into a system they tend to push for the addition of others like themselves, or complementary to themselves in function, partly in order to achieve the aims of the specialty more fully, and partly to strengthen the position of the specialty within the system. In Brookview, for example, during the past decade school psychologists, librarians and counsellors had been introduced and there were recurrent demands for an increase in their numbers on the grounds that more were needed to do an adequate job according to the standards prevailing in the educational field.

What we have called "upgrading" is in large part a result of a drive for professional status on the part of lower-ranking occupations, and for increased professional privileges and rewards on the part of the already recognized

---

6. These tendencies appear to be approaching their logical limit in the new programs for the education of culturally deprived children. According to an NEA analysis ("Class Size in Elementary School," NEA Research Bulletin, Vol. 43, No. 4, Dec., 1965, p. 106): "The focal point in this new educational movement is the individual child....In some extreme cases a single pupil may constitute the full load of a specially trained teacher and in many other instances the service of a teacher will be limited to a small group."

professions. The drive for professional status goes hand in hand with specialization and aims at raising the level of prestige and salary of each specialty, in competition with others, and in increasing occupational autonomy, especially as against control exercised by laymen either in the organization or in the community. For example, the school nurses in Brookview were demanding to be put on the same professional salary schedule as the teaching staff. There were recurrent requests for additions to the staff and facilities of the audio-visual center. The Teachers' Association was becoming increasingly aggressive in demanding a greater share in the decisions of the board of education, professional autonomy in such matters as development and enforcement of a professional code of ethics, and an ever-rising professional salary schedule.

The Educational World

Although the specific demands for expansion arise within the system itself, they are encouraged and given form by influences from the educational world, a complex of educational associations, teacher training and research institutions, publishing enterprises, accrediting and regulatory agencies, and governmental advisory bodies and commissions; all of which are in turn linked with the universities and other institutions of the intellectual establishment. The local school system has many connections with this world, the most important of which is the participation of its professional personnel in their respective state and national associations. The associations and the training institutions (supplemented by the publishing industry) provide the main channels through which modifications of educational standards and practice are made known and advocated, in this way influencing local systems to intensify their educational programs. The associations also have a unique role in advocating and supporting the demands for occupational advancement of their members, providing formulations of aims and suggestions of strategy to be used in drives for occupational

benefits and enhancement of status. They supply the statistics which enable the members of any local system to compare their occupational benefits with those of other school systems, and to play the competitive game in which a boost in salaries or benefits in one system is used to press the boards in other systems to meet or surpass it. There is a continuous stimulation and steering of educational innovation, of the occupational differentiation that accompanies innovation, and of the professional claims that grow with both.[7] Although these claims may be partly reduced and modified by the administrators within the system, they are eventually passed on and become an element in the pressure of the expanding system against the local community.

The Local Community

Innovations in the system bear differentially upon a community consisting of numerous categories and groups of people who stand in different role-relationships with the educational system -- as citizens, voters, taxpayers, businessmen, political leaders, and as parents (to name the most important). These roles may be separated or may overlap in various combinations. For present purposes we might make a crude distinction between personal and impersonal relations with the schools. The most significant personal relationship, that between school and parents, also creates a direct link between the school and these parents in their other roles as, say, taxpayers and voters in school-board elections. Taxpayers and voters without children, or whose children attend non-public schools, perform important functions in the cycle of school-community interchanges, yet lack the personal contact and involvement of the others.

Innovations in the system have different meanings and entail different

---

7. The educational world, of course, interprets and transmits large-scale societal demands. At the time of our field-work, the post-Sputnik demand for the intensification of science and mathematics training was still strong.

obligations for these two categories; for those with no children in the schools, innovation means an increase in annual taxes in return for intangible future benefits to the welfare of the community as a whole; for those with children in the schools there may be immediate benefits in addition. In some cases a special group of parents will benefit, for example, the parents of brain-damaged children when special classes are instituted for these; or the parents of "bright" children who are afforded accelerated programs; in other instances, for example, an expansion of library resources, all parents will, in theory at least, receive a benefit. But the changes are not necessarily seen as unalloyed benefits, even by parents, since some innovations may involve new and unwelcome obligations. The introduction of new programs oriented towards college entrance may encourage an interest in college education on the part of students whose parents do not welcome this interest. The introduction of psychological services may mean that parents are pressed to learn a new way of looking at children's conduct; they may also be asked to re-examine their own conduct and to redefine their parental responsibilities; and some may find their traditional patterns of family life under attack. Or, if the parents do not feel that the pattern of their relations with the school has been affected directly, they may resent the special attentions and services being given to others. In any case, they may weigh any given innovation unfavorably against its money cost.

Social Class Influences

Such calculations of immediate and future personal benefits and costs are also affected by social class perspectives in which the nature and desired ends of education are defined differently. Nearly everyone in Brookview would agree that every child should "achieve his maximum potential," but the full implications of this slogan appear to be especially congenial to the outlook of the most highly educated, the upper-middle-class professionals and intellectuals,

whose own success is seen by them as depending upon intellectual competitiveness and self-discipline, inventiveness, and personal style; the petit-businessmen, whose "service club" speeches extoll competition, seem to be more concerned in practice that their children learn the values of teamwork and conformity appropriate to the corporation office; the blue-collar class, on the other hand, with its limited perspectives on the personality and educational requirements for success at higher occupational levels is likely to be unconvinced of the need for more intensified or extended education, and inclined to resent having its tax money spent for the college preparation of other people's children.

The blue-collar workers also seem most likely to resist the claims of the school people to professional status and salary levels, regarding school teaching as a soft job which ought not to pay unmarried women more for what appears to be part-time work than men who are family heads earn for a full-time day in the factory. It is not uncommon to find among them people who view all organizations as inherently corrupt and self-serving and who assume that the school administrators are lining their pockets in some way with taxpayers' money. Among the storekeepers who regard themselves as representatives of the business world, it is often assumed that the schools are managed inefficiently by men who have no "business sense." Among the elderly, there is a tendency to believe that "an education" more elaborate than they received fifty years ago is unnecessary.

Religious Influences

Cutting across and modifying or intensifying these general class perspectives run the influences of religious ideology. In particular, the orthodoxies of fundamentalist religions and their associated nationalistic pieties, especially strong in the blue-collar and lower-white-collar classes, make

these groups receptive to charges that the psychological services of the schools are meddling with parental authority, and indeed with the foundations of belief, and they are alienated by the unorthodox ideas and unconventional behavior that seem to result from "modern" education.

The extent to which organized religious groups influenced educational affairs could not be established without an intensive community study. Church intervention is generally regarded as highly improper, and although there was much private gossip on the subject, public reference to it seemed to be subject to an absolute taboo, even in the heat of election controversy, as if merely to mention religion would be regarded as evidence of prejudice. Such intervention as came to our notice was chiefly a matter of church leaders advising their followers with respect to their vote on the budget and recommending preferred board candidates. Private advice of this kind was reported from most denominations. Jewish congregational leaders were generally reported as favoring the expansionist trends of the school system while the Catholic leaders were said to oppose them, and the Protestant churches were divided. How much influence these leaders had we could not determine. Voting patterns showed that the budgets tended to be supported most strongly in areas where Jewish residents predominated, and defeated in Catholic areas, but it was impossible, in this type of analysis, to separate religious affiliations from the class and income factors with which they were associated.

<u>The Educational-Political System</u>

The state law governing the educational system of Brookview provides three means by which the community may act to control the development of the system: the election of board members; a referendum on the annual budget; and referenda on bond issues for acquisition of property and expansion of physical plant.

In these elections the community passes judgment on the adequacy with which

the system has performed its functions, and makes decisions on the proposals of the administrators for changes and innovations in its structure and performance. Into the annual debate are fed the arguments for and against the current state and direction of the system that arise at the various crucial points where the educational process affects the interests and values of sub-groups of the community. The organizing of this decision has become, in Brookview, the work of an informal educational political system which stands outside of, and is only remotely connected, with the official politics of municipal and state government. The law provides merely that properly qualified citizens may register and run as candidates for the school board, and during the nineteen forties candidates presented themselves in this "independent" way. In the fifties a political association was organized to support the physical expansion program of the school system by mobilizing a favorable vote on bond issues and budgets and electing candidates who favored the expansion plans. Opposing candidates still ran as independents. In the sixties, as the opposition to continued development of the system increased and hardened, an opposition group was organized, and a typical bipartisan system emerged. As might be expected, this political dichotomy tended to polarize the educational issues -- a liberal party tending to synthesize the various demands from the community and from within the system itself for elaboration and refinement of the system and a conservative party resisting this trend on the basis of an amalgam of the currents of criticism and discontent.

In general, the conservative party appeared to receive its basic support from the low-income people, predominantly blue-collar workers or elderly pensioners, and in religion either Roman Catholic or Protestant fundamentalists. The large Italian group played a prominent role in this party. The liberal party typically received its support from middle- and upper-middle-class Protestants

and Jews of higher income and education. The political associations received informal support from many of the local organizations -- churches, service clubs, patriotic and cultural societies, etc. -- but these generally operated in the background because it was considered somewhat illegitimate for them to participate in "partisan" politics of any kind. In particular, the churches are under the official taboo of separation of church and state. In this more-or-less behind the scenes mobilization of political forces, the school people have the advantage of their connections with the PTA organizations which, in Brookview at least (apparently not so in Harlem), are identified with the professional staff of the schools and are led by people imbued with the educational culture who have become, as it were, quasi-official participants in the system.

Control of the System

The vote on the school budget is the climax of an annual cycle of development of educational plans in which the school administration, led by the Superintendent, works out its compromises with the various factions of the board of education. Control of the board through a majority of members is an even more substantial basis for power over the system's course than is a party's success in the budget referendum; and a sympathetic administration is still more reliable, because more permanent, than control over the board. The political struggle therefore inevitably involves control over the appointment and tenure in office of the Superintendent. It also follows that the farther down into the system the control of the dominant party extends, the more it can affect the proposals of the staff with respect to organization and program. If the superintendent is like-minded, the control is exerted through him and follows the constituted lines of authority; but if he is antagonistic, the dominant party may try to dislodge him, or to get at his staff directly, or both. But it cannot get at the staff and exercise control of the internal phases of program development without

violating the line of privilege which separates the administrative sphere from the policy-making sphere, and without affronting the organized professional staff.

Under the most favorable conditions, the relations between board, superintendent, and staff must be equivocal since they depend upon an understanding of their respective functions which appears to be a product more of custom and the intra-institutional power struggle than of legal authority. The notion that the proper role of the board is to determine policy, of the superintendent to recommend and administer it, and of the technical staff to execute was thought of by many people in Brookview as an assignment of responsibilities having the force of an elementary constitutional separation of powers; but in fact the state statutes bestow upon the board almost unlimited power and responsibility over every detail of the educational process. What authority the board delegates to the superintendent appears to be less a matter of legal requirement than a matter of mutual agreement, supported by customary expectations, and by the limits of what the administrative and technical staff and their supporters would put up with. Consequently, the distribution of functions depends to a considerable degree upon a largely tacit bargain with the board which may be relatively stable in some circumstances, but quite unstable in others. It appeared to us that the teaching staff in Brookview, in its drive for increasing professional autonomy, was attempting to change the terms of the bargain in its favor by reducing the powers of the superintendent a little, and the powers of the board a great deal. This movement came into head-on conflict with the drive by the conservative board members to reassert lay authority over the system and to resist the expansion of program and costs. Both forms of aggrandizement of power operated to diminish the power of the superintendent who stood between the two parties.

Intervention by Professional Associations

During our two-year period of observation, the conservatives succeeded in defeating a budget and electing additional conservative members to the board: the board was then balanced, four to four, between conservatives and liberals, with a ninth member holding the balance of power and shifting from side to side. The conservatives obtained majorities for several actions on courses of study and staff appointments which were interpreted as invasions of the prerogatives of the professional staff, and which served to increase the militancy of the professionals and of their leaders in the teachers' association: moreover, after the first superintendent's resignation, the temporary absence of a superintendent brought these leaders into direct confrontations with the board.

During this ominous period, the backing of the local school people by their outside educational organizations played a significant and, on occasion, decisive role. For example, a representative of the state teachers' organization participated in the strategy meetings of the executive committee of the teachers' association in its conflict with the board; and at the climax of an attempt by the board to introduce changes in the high school curriculum without the approval of its principal, the board was forced to back down by a threat of loss of accreditation by the regional accrediting agency. Thus, in the critical moments, when it appeared that community interests were overriding the professional staff and reducing its autonomy, the educational world with which it is allied, and from which it receives its ideological direction and moral support, became an active agent in resisting local power.

The Role of Government

Government, the fourth major participant in the Brookview educational field, was relatively unobtrusive during our field work and we have not attempted to study its role in detail. The state government established the

ground-rules of the local organization and its procedures -- especially economic and political. It prescribed and supervised a complex accounting procedure to guarantee the safe custody of the taxpayer's money, and an equally complex procedure to guarantee honest elections; it provided for the licensing of school personnel and assured them various safeguards and benefits; but it had relatively little to say about the standards of education or the internal operations of school systems except to promulgate minimum curriculum requirements emphasizing patriotism and good citizenship. In short, the state's role appeared to be the traditional role of government in the market place under a laissez-faire economy: to guarantee minimum standards, order and fair play in what it assumed to be an essentially local and competitive enterprise.[8]

Perhaps the most important thing to be said about this fourth factor in the educational scheme of things is that the government's role is one of the usually unseen and taken-for-granted constraints which prevent the educational-political conflicts from getting out of hand and destroying the functional coherence of school system and community. It embodies, in a way, the taken-for-granted agreements and expectations to which all members of the community assent -- the agreement that public education is a necessary function of the community, and that it has to be effected at something approximating the standards set in American society generally. The parties are able to quarrel safely only because they are already united on these premises.

Yet the state government, too, exerts a long range inflationary pressure on the local system as it gradually falls in line with the movements of the educational world -- periodically raising mandatory salary minima for teachers,

---

8. The role of the national government had begun to be foreshadowed in small ways such as in grants of money for upgrading science teaching, but given the absence of minority groups and of slums in Brookview, it will probably be some time before the more recent expansions of the national government's role will become significantthere.

increasing minimum fringe benefits, recognizing and licensing new specialties, and generally consolidating professional gains. The equilibrium it protects moves on an upward course.

The Battle of Educational Expansion

The discussion up to this point may be summarized by saying that the general course of development emerging from the transactional network we have outlined has been one of generally uninterrupted expansion in the size, range of services and organizational complexity of the educational system, led by the demands of the professional staff, supported by the advice and, at critical moments, the active intervention of the professional associations, looked upon favorably (or at least not interfered with) by the state, supported by a political coalition of local citizens, and opposed by a coalition of roughly equal power.

We may surmise that Brookview reached a critical point in this expansion when it began to be apparent, probably in the mid-fifties, that the educational cost curve was not levelling off, as many must have expected and hoped for, as population growth began to reach its limits. The extent to which growth was increasingly a function of the ideology and interests of the professional staff and of their educational world rather than of the pressures of increasing enrollment must have been gradually revealed. In 1956, for the first time, a proposed school operating budget was disapproved; the budget was again defeated in 1961, to the accompaniment of a bitter political struggle which led to the resignation of the then superintendent. In 1965 the budget was again defeated and the superintendent, who was brought in to put the system to rights in 1963, resigned in 1966. The struggle over whether the system should be stabilized or should, as its defenders would say, "move forward," continues unabated.

Professional Power and Local Autonomy

In connection with the continuing political struggle there was (and still is) in Brookview an atmosphere of bitterness and reciprocal hostility which was damaging to the morale of the educational staff and to the unity of the town. Although the hostility of one side was answered by the hostility of the other, and so built up to periodic crises, it was the conservatives who typically initiated these attacks and who injected the emotional violence into educational controversy. Granted that the pressures of expansion bore especially heavily upon the religious sectarians by constantly raising the competitive standards and price of private education; and upon the lower classes because they served to advance a "middle classification" of education which might seem inappropriate in content and cost to these classes; and granted, too, that because of the superior organizing skills of the middle class supporters of educational expansion, they more often dominated the board of education -- still there seemed to be something disproportionate, over-determined in the opposition response.

In Brookview it was sometimes said that the emotional level of controversy about the school budget was high because the budget determines the only tax rate over which taxpayers have any control, and so they take out on this tax the resentment they feel about the intractable state and national taxes. Perhaps so. But the exasperation of those who wished to cut the school taxes seemed to be greatly increased by the fact that they appeared to be unable to do it, even during those periods when conservatives controlled the school board. The convergence of forces behind the expansion of the system was such that in spite of the appearance of local control, the community was limited in its power to affect either the content or direction of the system's development, although it is the community that must pay for it. The board could apply restraints to the budget, that is, to the rate of growth, but could not prevent growth entirely.

This condition is symbolized by the fact that in Brookview a struggle so bitter that it has driven two superintendents out of office in the span of five years has actually been concerned with differences on the order of a few hundred thousand dollars in budgets of five millions or more, sums proposed for relatively marginal forms of elaboration of the basic program such as a summer camp program, an expanded in-service training program, and the like. During the same period there has been a steady increase in staff and facilities, in salaries and other costs. The determination of these basic costs is a product of forces which the conservative group in the community cannot effectively resist: the rising educational requirements of the work world, the increasing national standardization of educational practices running with an increasingly uniform national culture; and these constraints reinforced by an increasingly aggressive coalition of national professional associations sometimes using the agencies of government as their instrument. Although the forms of local determination of the school system continue in effect, it would appear that local control is becoming something of a fiction. Aside from the economic problem this creates for many of the local residents, it also represents a further and painful attack upon one of their sacred values, local autonomy, a value which appears to be increasingly anachronistic in the current era.

The Problem of the Open End

From the educators' point of view, the unending and often violent political conflict in which they were engaged in Brookview was a sign that too many people in the town did not "understand" or "appreciate" the meaning of "good education." It was often said that poor communication was at fault, and that if only the right means of communication could be found the troubles would disappear. But, in fact, even among the supporters of the expansionist policy there were some who were concerned because the educators seemed unable or unwilling to suggest

that some optimum state of the system might be reached at some foreseeable time in the future. It seemed to us that, like other organizations serving other functions in American life, the school system is assumed by its leaders to be moving forward through an endless progression of improvements in quality as new discoveries of science and technology contribute to its infinite perfectability. Although there are some internal controls on development, the system depends chiefly upon external resistance to set its limits at any given time. The resistance is a product of the competition among various agencies and institutions for limited community resources. Until some more rational procedure is available for the planning of community life, it would appear that a political struggle among the interested parties is a necessary condition of orderly growth of the system and of its adjustment to community needs, however much deplored by the educators themselves.

DH:rmk
1/20/67

PSYCHIATRY AND THE SCHOOLS

Ronald Leifer, M.D., M.A.
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry
State University of New York, Upstate Medical
Center at Syracuse

Men generally have the desire for self-instruction only in so far as they are freed from the yoke of tradition; for as long as the latter governs intelligence it is all-sufficient and jealous of any rival."

Emile Durkheim, (1, p.162.)

An understanding of the role of psychiatry in modern education requires, first of all, the debunking of the popular idea that psychiatry is a medical discipline which deals with health and illness. This commonly held view is not so much idea as it is ideology: it is a more or less conscious disguise of the social and ethical nature of psychiatric theory and practice for certain social purposes. (2)

The medical physician is concerned with the understanding, diagnosis, treatment and prevention of diseases of the body. Medical theories employ the language and methods of the physico-biological sciences in order to facilitate interventions in undesirable bodily processes. (3,4) Although the health of the body may influence social performance, and although in the pursuit of bodily health the physician is often concerned with social and cultural processes such as dietary patterns, food handling, sewage disposal and sexual practices, his ultimate interest is in the breakdown and repair of bodily structure and function.

Psychiatrists, on the other hand, although they often employ the rhetoric and trappings of medicine, are ultimately concerned with individual conduct and social relationships. There is no facet of the human drama which has escaped psychiatric interest from the phenomena of consciousness, birth, death, religion and art to crime, poverty, the cold war and the future of civilization. The interests of psychiatrists are not limited to observing and theorizing. They are active participants in modern social life: they analyze and counsel troubled individuals; they assist in the legal determination of who is fit to stand trial, make a will or be executed;

they rehabilitate criminals and mend broken marriages; and they advise business, government, schools and the military about personnel management problems. Recently they have become involved in programs for the creation of a "Great Society" and for the elimination of social evils such as poverty, illiteracy, boredom and crime. (5,6) Finally, in all these activities the psychiatrist, unlike other medical physicians, possesses great social power by virtue of his ability to deface an individual by labelling him as mentally ill and to deprive him of his liberty by means of involuntary psychiatric hospitalization. (7)

This difference between medicine and psychiatry is also manifested in school health programs. The school dental consultant, for instance, is interested in the status of the student's teeth and not in his social adjustment. The school physician is interested in the growth, development and health of the student's body and not (or only secondarily) in whether he is a disrupting influence in the classroom, whether he is performing up to his potential or whether he displays the proper sexual attitudes.

The psychiatrist, on the other hand, has become fully involved in the form, content and technique of the educational process. There is a trend towards the increasing participation of "mental health workers" in the schools. Guidance counsellors, psychologists, social workers and psychiatrists are joining the teacher to form a "mental health team" which functions to supervise the character development, intellectual achievement and social adjustment of the student. These functions are accomplished by means of "diagnostic" psychological tests, special classes for "emotionally disturbed" and "exceptional" children, counselling, psychotherapy, group

therapy, family therapy, social casework and consultations with teachers and school administrators. (8,9,10,11)

The intimate participation of psychiatrists in the schools is due to the fact that like educators, they engage in social and moral activities the character of which is deeply rooted in socio-historical process and change. The aims and techniques of educational and mental health practices overlap. This accounts for similarities in the formulation of their ideals, for instance in terms of the full development of potential or the successful adaptation of an individual to his society; it also accounts for the interpretation of psychotherapy as educational and of education as therapeutic. (12,13) The description and explanation of psychiatric practices in the language of medicine, as a medical specialty which deals with mental health and illness, is a disguise. It disguises the social and moral aspects of psychiatric practices in order to justify and facilitate certain social functions. Those who wish to understand the role of psychiatry in the modern school must penetrate this disguise.

WHAT IS PSYCHIATRY?

The rhetoric of health and disease.

The rhetoric of medical practice is uniquely suited to perform disguised social functions. This is particularly true of the concepts of health and disease which are actually positive and negative ideals the ethical nature of which has become obscured by the illusion of scientific objectivity: they pass as scientifically specified states which are allegedly free from the arbitrary influence of human interests. However, the concepts of health

and disease, in medicine as well as in psychiatry, are the restatement of human values in the lexicon of science. (14) They therefore lend themselves to be used to justify actions in terms of the unimpeachable (and often unintelligible) authority of scientific (or medical) technology rather than in terms of explicit social values.

There is thus an advantage to the definition of psychiatry as a branch of medical science. Claims which bear the mark of science are generally considered to carry the guarantee of truth, insofar as that evanescent quality can be guaranteed at all. Consequently the claim that certain statements are scientific may serve more to persuade others to believe them to be true than to denote that they have successfully passed the rigorous tests of logic and empirical falsification. Notwithstanding the validity of the assertion that recommendations for action cannot be derived from statements of fact, the testimonials of science have become, in our age of the scientific authority, the most convincing justifications for social action.

As a pseudo-scientific crypto-ideal, the term "disease" may be applied to any situation which is judged to be undesirable and in need of corrective action. Similarly, any ideal towards which it is deemed desirable to strive may be labelled as "health." The interventions by means of which the transformation from the undesirable to the desirable state, from "disease" to "health" is accomplished may be described as the technology of medical or psychiatric science. The rhetoric of health and disease is thus flexible enough to encompass virtually all human activities, including education. Indeed, the involvement of mental health workers in the schools should not

be construed as the progressive expansion of medical services; it should be viewed as the expanding application of medical and psychiatric rhetoric to the school situation.

The involvement of psychiatrists in the modern school situation is only one manifestation of the generalized expansion of psychiatric practices. This expansion is related to critical and complex changes in the character of Western life, which although they are of ancient origin, have accelerated recently and penetrate into every aspect of the modern (urban) experience. Three related aspects of this change are directly relevant to the development of psychiatry as a modern social institution and hence, to the employment of psychiatrists in the schools. First, the transformation of the character of social power. Second, the erosion of the traditional structure for evaluating and guiding human conduct. Third, the emergence of the individual as a distinct social unit.

Psychiatry and the transformation of social power.

In ancestral social orders, the primitive and peasant community, the individual was bonded to the larger group by means of the primary associative structures: the family, the clan and the small settlement. Systems of authority and social control were diffusely distributed throughout these groups and were exercised in an intimate and personal, albeit often cruel, coercive and arbitrary manner. (15) With the move towards urbanization and civilization the influence and authority of the small, mediating associative group declined and the individual and the collective emerged as the predominant units of social life. (16,17,18)

With the curtailment of the influence of the family and the community, the increase in the size of social groups, the specialization of social as well as technical functions and the emergence of nation-states, the exercise of social authority and social power was increasingly allocated to the collective, particularly to centralized government. In contrast to communities, collectives tend to be large, impersonal, bureaucratically organized groups which participate in the technicalized, specialized, routinized, round of modern industrial life.

The dissolution of the primary associative bonds and the heterogenization and weakening of traditional values, standards and ideologies contributed to the progressive cultural defrocking of the individual. Only in this nakedness could man discover his true nature as a social animal, yet the conditions of this self-discovery were also the conditions of his agony: his moral uncertainty, confusion of identity, existential anxiety and alienation.

At the same time, the emergence of the individual as a social unit gave rise to a spirit of humanism and individual freedom. The political structure which was delegated the task of preserving this spirit was constitutional government, based on the principles of contract and rule of law. In one sense, government by rule of law is anarchic in that it serves as a restraint on the arbitrary use of power by the state. The centralization of authority and power in the state and the simultaneous valuation of individual freedom, which requires a restraint on the use of that power, combined to create a deep tension in Western civilization which has been a major factor in the development of modern psychiatry.

In spite of the transfer of civil authority to the State and the transcription of moral standards into law, many elements of traditional morality persist which are not codified in law. In other words, guidelines for conduct in modern societies are provided both by contract (law) and by traditional formulae of obligation (morals). Formerly, these traditional guidelines were enforced by family, clan and community authority; now, many of them are unenforcable by the State which must avoid framing laws which are so strict that they violate our sense of individual freedom. There are no laws against talking jibberish, believing that one is Napoleon, grieving without proper social cause or protecting oneself against an imagined persecutor. While we value rule of law and the individual freedoms it safeguards, we are disturbed by and demand the control of behavior which is not illegal, but which is in violation of certain traditional social standards of conduct. Yet with the weakening of those social structures which formerly enforced these standards, we lack legitimate machinery for this control.

In these circumstances a new social institution was required which, under the auspices of an acceptable modern authority could inconspicuously and justifiably supplement the social control exercised by law without violating our publicly avowed ideals of individual freedom. Psychiatry is perfectly suited for this task.

Having developed as a medical discipline, psychiatry can offer the credentials of the bio-physical sciences; it may thus trade on the prestige and influence of modern science which is in the process of replacing the authority of religious belief, myth and dogma as the source of certainty and truth. By employing the crypto-ethical rhetoric of health and disease,

In this function, psychiatrists have joined hands with and serve as the agent of the state which supports and administers a vast network of "mental" institutions. The fact that these institutions serve as repositories and reformatories for the morally and socially deviant has not gone unnoticed by the general public, particularly by the poor against whom it is mainly used. (20) The well-known power of the psychiatrist to deprive individuals of their freedom by labelling them as mentally ill and committing them or detaining them in state institutions colors all of his other activities and hangs as a Damocles Sword over anyone who is the object of his professional attention. (21) It potentiates the psychiatrist's power to deface; and it magnifies his capacities as an agent of social control. The psychiatrist thus may be a valuable asset to a school which requires his assistance for maintaining discipline and for excluding disturbing students.

Psychiatry and the erosion of traditional guidelines of conduct.

With the decline of community, the complexity of the social environment has increased immeasurably. At the same time, relatively little provision has been made for preparing individuals with adequate methods for guiding and evaluating conduct in this environment. In "Little Communities" the socialization process involved the intimate encounter of children with virtually all of the dimensions of a well-defined, well-bounded, relatively undifferentiated cultural territory. (22) The rules of social conduct were clearly set forth by the obligations of status and custom; the social environment was relatively stable and predictable and significant social choices were guided by precedent and group opinion. The daily round of

psychiatrists have codified social standards of conduct in scientific-sounding language: behavior which violates a social sense of propriety, safety and stability is labelled as "mental illness"; behavior which is considered to be proper, safe and productive is labelled as "mental health." (19) The social utility of the medical rhetoric in psychiatry is thus that psychiatric activities are classified as scientific and medical rather than social and ethical. This, in turn, permits the substitution of scientific (or medical) authority for social authority. More precisely stated, it permits social authority to mask itself with scientific credentials and scientific credibility.

As "experts" in the modern "science" of human engineering, psychiatrists enforce standards of conduct by two methods: First, by defacing and stigmatizing persons who violate these standards by labelling them as mentally ill. In spite of attempts to "educate" the public to the contrary, the label of mental illness is unlike that of any other illness in that it carries the implication of social deviance and it implies that the individual to whom it is ascribed is not responsible for his actions. There is no more devastating form of social defacement than to treat a man's actions as the irrelevant utterings and gestures of a madman.

The second method of social control is by means of involuntary psychiatric commitment. Under the guise of providing diagnostic and treatment services for the mentally ill, psychiatrists may detain, punish and "correct" individuals who, while they have violated no laws, have transgressed certain rules of social demeanor. Involuntary mental hospitalization thus affords a greater degree of protection and social control than is provided by laws which must avoid being so strict that they violate the principle of individual freedom.

life was a comparatively harmonious integration of the economic, social, political and religious dimensions of existence: it was anchored in moral certainty and a coherent world view; and it was ratified by myth and ceremony. (17)

Today, the complexity of life has been increased by technological inventions, the mixing of cultures and values, the abstraction, bureaucratization and impersonalization of social authority, rapid social change and population growth. At the same time, old certainties, standards and customs have been assaulted, contradicted and rendered obsolete. The weakening of the traditional primary associative structures has also weakened the major historical mechanism for the socialization and education of the young. Thus, while the individual has been emancipated from the shackles of ancestral social authority, his new found personal freedom has increased the burdens and confusions of choice-making for him; and the personal freedom of others has diminished the stability and predictability of his social environment.

It is, of course, an error to think of the modern individual as completely emancipated; there remains and will always remain social, legal and economic obstacles, in varying degrees, to the uninhibited fulfillment of his desires. Also, the persistence of traditional moral values, as they are transmitted by the family during socialization, represent restraints on choice, albeit psychological restraints. In this sense, the family is a coercive social unit to whose values the child is obliged to adhere (or rebel). Thus psychologically, the modern individual experiences both a sense of liberation and emancipation from the tyranny of traditional and familial social obligations and also a continuing sense of loyalty and an

inclination to conform to them. Consequently, he is subject to deep psychological conflicts: on the one hand, he feels justified, by the spirit of individual freedom, to make new, creative, autonomous choices; on the other hand, he feels obligated to conform his behavior to traditional, familial moral standards.

Thus, modern life has increased the difficulties and hazards of growing up. There is an increasing contrast and incompatibility between the patterns of socialization of the child and the complicated expectations and privileges of adult life. (23,24) The persistence of childhood patterns of learning may have no value to the adult, or they may even be maladaptive for him. The persistence of an attitude of obedience, which is required of the child, may be an asset to the adult in a Little Community; however, it may leave the modern adult subject to the influence of others, or to the influence of fixed standards and principles of conduct which may seriously handicap his ability to use his own independent, empirically based judgment so essential for solving problems of conduct in complex modern societies.

Under these circumstances, the casualties of social life were bound to increase; and a specialized means for dealing with these casualties was bound to develop and to thrive. Psychiatry is such an institution. By means of psychotherapy, psychiatrists may provide supplementary socialization and educational experiences to individuals who are judged to be unprepared (or unwilling) to meet the complicated opportunities and obligations of modern life. Although their theories have been expressed in the language of biology and medicine, psychiatrists have codified prevalent ideals of socialization and education in their definitions of mental health and the

goals of psychotherapy. By garbing their practices in the mantle of medicine, they are able to implement those aims with the authority of science. Thus, psychiatry may be construed as a secular, pseudo-scientific priesthood, which by codifying rules for evaluating and guiding conduct as principles of mental hygiene, provides a secular ethic for modern man, who, having lost the guidelines of traditional social authority, eagerly grasps for substitutes from the modern authority of science.

Psychiatry, the group and the individual.

Let us review what has been said thus far. Modern psychiatry is a social practice which develops where the small community and the extended family disintegrate thus releasing the "alienated" individual as a social unit; and it develops in the economic and political context of industrial democracies where covert forms of social control are required to supplement rule of law. Where the family remains strong and influential and where the state is powerful and unrestrained by laws which favor individual rights and freedoms, psychiatry (as it exists in this country) is poorly developed or non-existent.

One of the functions of psychiatry is to serve as an instrument for the social control of individuals. (As such an instrument, the mental health rhetoric is particularly well suited for use against individuals rather than groups.) In the guise of the physician, psychiatrists respond to a public mandate for a degree of social order and tranquility which is greater than can be provided by democratic institutions and rule of law. This control is accomplished by the employment of psychiatric power to influence and restrain individuals by defacing them with the label of mental

illness and by depriving them of their freedom by means of involuntary psychiatric commitment.

Another function of psychiatry is to provide supplementary educational and socialization experiences for individuals who have been judged (or who judge themselves) to be inadequately prepared to meet the complicated demands of modern life. In this function, the psychiatrist as a psychotherapist, most closely resembles the educator. Psychotherapy, like education, is a method of influencing people. In general, there are two techniques for exerting influence over others which, although they may be employed simultaneously, are distinguishable from one another: First, by means of employing social power over them, that is, by systems of reward and punishment; second, by means of conveying information to them. In the first case, the influence results in specific alterations of conduct; it reduces choice by encouraging some actions and discouraging others. In the second case, the influence results in the alteration of the <u>capacity</u> to act; it increases choice by maximizing alternatives, refining skills and providing foresight. I will first briefly discuss two forms of psychotherapy which roughly correspond to these two forms of influence; then I will outline the relevance of these to mental health practices in the school.

1. Psychotherapy as the supplementary ethnicization of the individual.

Ethnicization has been defined by George Devereaux as " ... an area of controlled and direct experience whose manifest purpose is to polarize, orient and mold... unoriented capacities, in a particular manner, which is adapted to, and oriented with reference to, the prevailing cultural pattern.

The process of ethnicization can, thus, be viewed as a process of directed choice." (13, p. 15) Ethnicization, in other words, is a form of indoctrination or training for culturally specific traits, attitudes and actions.

While every psychotherapeutic encounter may advance the ethnicization of the participants, there is one form of psychotherapy in which this is the explicit aim. It is characteristic of this type of therapy that its aims may be specified in terms of particular traits, attitudes and actions to be adopted by the patient; and it is characteristic of these aims that they correspond to prevalent patterns within the group or sub-group in which the patient lives or works. For instance, these goals may include: transforming an individual's homosexual patterns into heterosexual ones; influencing a criminal to be law abiding; inducing an alcoholic to give up alcohol; replacing a person's depressed mood with one which is more euphoric; replacing paranoid ideas with ideas which are closer to the general consensus; encouraging a truant student to attent school regularly; improving the academic performance of an "under-achiever" and so on.

It is important to note that Devereaux describes ethnicizing experiences as <u>controlled</u> and <u>directed</u>.. This is also true of ethnicizing psychotherapy. The therapist may exercise control and direction of his patient in a number of ways, all of which involve the use of social power. First, he may exercise social power over his patient by refusing to renounce involuntary psychiatric commitment by explicitly threatening his patient with it or by actually committing him. Second, he may exercise control over his patient by refusing to guarantee absolute confidentiality, by threatening to communicate or

actually communicating with a third party who has power over the patient, such as his employer, his school, his family, the police, the courtsor governmental agencies. Third, he may wield influence over his patient by setting conditions for the conduct of therapy which involve the patient's outside activities; for instance, he may disapprove of or direct that his patient desist from crime, suicide, homosexuality, divorce and other actions which he may consider to be contrary to the patient's welfare or that of others. Finally, the therapist may control and direct his patient by formulating the goals of therapy which represent the standards by which the patient's progress is judged. Representatives of these goals are those mentioned by Karl Menninger: the elimination of "immature" modes of sexuality; improved relationships with one's parents; a "mature" heterosexual partnership, preferably in marriage; acquisition of sexual attitudes appropriate to one's gender; an improved work pattern; moderation in play; a higher degree of sportsmanship and social participation; increased productivity, creativity and satisfaction; the use of persons as ends and things as means (rather than vice-versa); and a disappearance or dimunition of feelings of covetousness and power seeking. (26, pp.165-171) (For an interesting insight into psychiatric ambivalence towards social values and the ethnicization of patients, see the section of this book entitled "Neutrality and Ethics of the Therapist," pp. 93-98.)

The control and direction of another person's experience requires the use of social power; and it is the social power of the ethnicizing therapist, explicit and covert, which is the effective instrument for influencing his

patient's behavior. This is most true when the patient enters therapy involuntarily, for instance, if he is an inmate of a psychiatric hospital or if he has been ordered to enter therapy by his employer, his parent (in the case of a minor), a school official, a judge or some other person who is more socially powerful than he. In all forms of therapy the patient may wish to become better ethnicized, better adjusted to the prevalent social rules of conduct. The distinctive feature of ethnicizing therapy, however, is that the therapist formulates goals for the patient which correspond to the moral codes and ideals of his culture. If the patient engages in actions which are considered to be socially deviant or repugnant, the therapist will either employ his power to correct or punish the patient, he will employ his psychological and charismatic powers to alter the patient's behavior, or he will terminate therapy.

No doubt, many ethnicizing therapists would deny that they employ social power, real or psychological to mould their patient's behavior to prevailing social codes. The alternatives to this, however, are either that they reason with their patients towards this goal, that a proper emotional balance and integration of the patient's personality would result in the achievement of this goal or that they are willing to concede to their patients the right to be deviant. In the first case, they tacitly assume the Hegelian principle that prevailing social codes are rational and that the rational man would follow them. In the second case they assume an even more bizarre proposition, that prevailing social codes are most harmonious with man's emotional nature and that the well integrated man would adapt

himself to prevailing morality. In both of these cases, the relevance of social power to social values is ignored. In the third case, they would be practicing educational and not ethnicizing psychotherapy; and if they claimed this to be true, the burden would be on them to explain why they practice psychiatric commitment and why they often breach the rule of absolute confidentiality.

There are thus two features of ethnicizing psychotherapy which must be kept in mind. First, in this form of therapy the therapist exercises real social power over his patient; or he leaves open the possibility that he may exercise this power; or he does not disavow the intentional use of his psychological power to influence his patient's behavior outside of therapy. It is not sufficient for the therapist to disavow in his writings or speeches an interest in transmitting his ethics (and those of society) to his patients. In order to actually disavow the use of social power to influence his patient the therapist must adhere absolutely to the principle of confidentiality: under no circumstances whatsoever must he communicate with anyone about his patient. Also the therapist must avoid any social evaluation of his patient's conduct. This means that he must be able to tolerate any kind of behavior, even of the most extremely anti-social variety, outside of therapy. This tolerance must be expressed in his formulations of the goals of therapy; and it must withstand the vicissitudes of its being tested by the patient.

Second, in this form of therapy, the patient is expected to govern and judge his behavior on the basis of explicit, culture-specific and socially desirable standards of behavior. This implies that he ought to avoid behavior

that is criminal, morally deviant and socially undesirable. Often, therapists attempt to disguise this expectation by formulating the ideals of mental health in abstract terms such as the integration of personality, adaptation, the achievement of potential and so on. When these terms are instantiated with concrete actions which systematically include cultural virtues and exclude cultural vices, then they are simply crypto-ethical restatements of prevalent social standards of conduct and express the aims of ethnicization in an abstract spirit if not in a concrete form.

It should be apparent that both features of ethnicizing therapy are similar to all other instances of ethnicization: the child by the family, the student by the school, the prisoner by the prison, the soldier by the military and so on.

Since ethnicization aims at moulding specific patterns of action, it fosters inhibition by discouraging actions which are prohibited. It is a simple fact about social power that its primary function is to influence and control human conduct. Consequently, the exercise of social power is always associated with the inhibition of some individual's range of actions; and because of the intimate relationship between thought and action, the inhibition of thought, repression, also occurs. (27) Of course, the inhibition of action may stimulate fantasies about the proscribed conduct, however this amounts to the same thing from the educational viewpoint. It is difficult to develop refined intelligence about matters with which there is no direct personal experience or about which there is no opportunity at least to engage in self-correcting discourse. (28) Thus, the use of social power leads to repression in this weaker sense of inhibiting the development of practical intelligence.

Herein lies the Achilles heel of ethnicization. Both psychotherapy and schooling may provide ethnicizing experiences: they may involve the use of social power to orient and polarize behavior along culturally prescribed patterns. This training, while it enriches the capacity to engage in socially approved conduct also fosters repression and diminishes the capacity to engage in behavior which is defined as deviant. However, behavior which is defined as deviant at one stage of life, or in one social context, may be defined as desirable or even obligatory at other times and in other contexts. For instance, training a child to avoid sexual practices because they are "morally dirty" may have the effect of disabling him sexually at a time when sexual practices are socially acceptable.

In a complex society it is impossible for child-rearing practices to anticipate and prepare the individual for all the contingencies of adult life; nor is it possible to cancel the many rules, habits and styles of youth which become obsolete later. Modern life is far too complicated and diverse for individuals to be specifically prepared to function within all possible sub-groups and in all possible situations. This means that the use of flexible intelligence in the solution of practical problems of conduct is indispensable to modern man. However, the persistence of many childhood patterns of ethnicization predisposes to conflict, automaticity and to idiosyncratic symbolic ("neurotic"), rather than practical solutions to problems. Repression, inhibition and the doctrinaire compliance with contradictory and obsolete precedents of early learning also hamper the intelligent resolution of these problems. Thus, ethnicization runs counter to certain ideals of education, namely the unhampered development of flexible skills of intelligent choice-making which is a supra-cultural rather than a culturally specific capacity.

2. Psychotherapy as the supplementary education of the individual.

In contrast to ethnicization, education, as the term is used here, refers to the acquisition of information and skills which, although they do not omit moral problems, are neutral in terms of the prevalent value systems of a particular culture. Education involves the development of the capacity for intelligent discrimination in observation, formulation and action. In this sense of the term, education is a continuation of the development of biologically inherent human potentialities such as the capacity to communicate symbolically. According to this terminology, schooling consists of a combination of education, ethnicization (or indoctrination) and training (the acquisition of occupational skills.)

Education is thus more inclusive than ethnicization. It includes learning cultural lore, attitudes and actions, but it does not require the repression and inhibition of thoughts and actions which may be classified as socially deviant. For example, sexual ethnicization involves acquiring information and skills in socially acceptable and prescribed forms of sexual conduct; it also involves learning to avoid thinking about and doing sexual practices which are legally or morally defined as wrong. If the precepts of education, as they are defined here and as they are usually applied to non-moral subjects, are applied to sex, it would involve acquiring information about all aspects of sexual and practice; it would include learning about the social rules of sexual practice and the consequences of following or violating those rules. However, it would leave the individual free to engage in any sexual activity he chooses. Education, in other words, respects no taboos of thought or action. It encourages the individual to be free, but not to be stupid.

It involves the maximum development of the capacities of intelligence and choice-making, even with respect to socially deviant behavior. In contrast to ethnicization, therefore, education does not require the use of social power. It does require superior knowledge discriminating capacities and skills.

The model for psychotherapy as an educational experience for the individual is classical psychoanalysis or autonomous psychotherapy. (29) In order to understand psychotherapy as an educational rather than a medical activity it is necessary to view the individuals who avail themselves of it as distressed by problems in living rather than by mental illness. They suffer from confusion, uncertainty and ineptness in conduct as a result of misleading or inadequate rearing. (30, 31, 32)

Freud's early patients were plagued with dilemmas of conduct (the so-called "neurotic" conflict) which they resolved with symbolic compromises that sometimes resembled physical diseases. (4) Eager to have his new discoveries bear "the serious stamp of science" rather than the mark of the novel (33), Freud described these conflicts in terms of the natural opposition of indwelling biological instincts (the id, or in social language, the anti-social potentialities of the individual) to the internalized demands of society (super-ego.) By employing the rhetoric of biology and medicine to express the conflict between the individual's expression of his personal freedom and traditional social morality he could appear to be providing a socially and ethically neutral theory of human conduct (and mis-conduct.)

However, Freud recognized the non-medical nature of his "therapy" and advocated the practice of it by non-physicians. (34) By analyzing his patients,

Freud provided them with an understanding of the nature of their social selves in relation to the demands and opportunities offered by their social environment; and he provided them the chance to learn new patterns of conduct (working-through) while their behavior was simultaneously under the scrutiny of refined examination. Thus, psychoanalysis (or educative psychotherapy) is actually an education in personal biography in which unreflective, unskillful, habitual patterns of conduct are replaced by intelligent, skillful, flexible choice-making. (35)

In contrast to ethnicizing psychotherapy, educative psychotherapy attempts to avoid and reverse repression and inhibition. This requires that the therapist avoid the use of social power to influence his patient's conduct. Free discussion will not be possible in the therapeutic situation if the patient anticipates that the therapist may be either useful or dangerous to him outside of therapy; if he does anticipate this, then he will tend to express that which will be to his advantage, or he will tend to suppress and repress that which may be harmful to him. The therapist's assurance of absolute confidentiality and non-intervention in the life of the patient is thus a prerequisite for educative psychotherapy. In addition, any possibility that the patient is identifying with the super-ego (adopting the values) of the therapist, must be scrupulously brought to his attention.

Since the therapist does not wish to alter his patient's behavior to conform to particular cultural standards of conduct, but rather to enlarge the patient's capacities to act, the patient is the sole determinant and judge of his plans, actions and social arrangements. The therapist's task is to discuss the historical determinants, situational contexts, consequences

and alternatives of the patient's actions, including actions which are socially deviant.

By refusing to employ social power over his patients for the benefit of their families and society, Freud devised a new function for psychiatry (29): one in which the psychiatrist acted as the agent of the troubled individual to help him to attain a greater degree of mastery over the problems of his life than was provided by his socialization or school experiences. By refusing to act as an agent of social power, Freud also contributed to our understanding of it as an influence on human conduct and social affairs.

Prior to the invention of psychoanalysis, no educative or socializing practice had the exclusive goal of liberating the individual from the psychological restraints of repression and inhibition. To the contrary, all forms of social training involved the negative learning of prohibitions, taboos and forbidden thoughts. The process of socialization is intimately linked to the biological helplessness of the child and the consequent power of his parents over his life and conduct. (36) In communal life, parental authority is linked more openly to the authority of the group than in our civilization; and the socialization experience involves the transmission of cultural values, lore and tradition from the group to the individual. Intrinsic to the success of this transmission is the respect by the individual for the group and its representatives. Obedience, in other words, is the silent partner in successful socialization. (37) Freud's attention to the role of parental (particularly paternal) power and authority in the socialization of the child is a reflection of the isolation of the nuciear family

from the fabric of the community in which (he, as a Jew and) we live. The Oedipus Complex, which represents the struggle of the individual with authority, pertains to his struggle with all forms of social authority. (38)

The resolution of the Oedipus Complex, which must be accomplished in order to overcome repressions and inhibitions, therefore involves the critical examination of the influence of all forms of social (including parental) authority on the life and conduct of the individual. If the individual is to be the master of his actions, then the automatic influence of social power on those actions must be unrelentlessly challenged. (To phrase the same thought in psychoanalytic language: if the ego is to supervise conduct then it must dominate the super-ego.) This does not mean that all habits must be obliterated, for habits are necessary organizations of action; however, they should be at the call of the actor rather than unwanted and intrusive. (39) From the psychological point of view, the maximization of self-mastery over conduct requires the obliteration of the coercive, dogmatic influence of social institutions on conduct. It requires the transformation of the attitudes of automatic obedience and respect for social authority into independent critical judgment and the capacity to be deviant. (40)

Education when it is applied to conduct, is thus potentially psychologically (rather than politically) subversive to social order and social standards. It serves the individual by enabling him to develop self-control and unrepressed intelligence; but it also requires that he be able to choose to be deviant without suffering from feelings of shame, guilt and anxiety. From the time of the death of Socrates, purveyors of this kind of educative influence have been opposed, condemned and punished by society. It is perhaps for this

reason that the spirit of psychoanalysis has been permitted to thrive only in the secrecy of the analyst's private consulting room and only to those who are wealthy enough to purchase it in a private contract; and even this has been tolerated only because its character as a potentially subversive social instrument has been disguised from public awareness by the ideology and rhetoric of medicine and biology.

This interpretation of psychoanalytic therapy reveals a deep conflict in the patterns of education in the modern world. The complexities, contradictions and disharmonies of mass industrial life and the inadequacy of preparation for it may be transformed by the individual into confused, contradictory and irrelevant (mad) conduct unless he is able to achieve mastery and self-control by developing a commanding perspective of his cultural territory and a psychological liberation from coercive social influences. The achievement of these social skills requires the institutionalization of educative experiences which serve the individual; and it requires an enduring skepticism of social authority. However, socialization and schooling have always primarily served group purposes and as instruments of the group have tended to foster the anti-thetical qualities of repression, inhibition and the unquestioning respect for authority.

There are thus three themes in terms of which the function of psychiatry in the modern school must be understood. First, the psychiatrist may act as an instrument of the group to exercise social control over individuals by means of defacing and committing them. Second, the psychiatrist may serve the group as supplementary socializer to influence individuals to conform their behavior to socially acceptable standards. Third, the psychiatrist

may serve as educator of a new and revolutionary type to serve the individual by helping him to gain self-control by means of a commanding perspective of his biography and liberation from the influence of automatic learning.

PSYCHIATRY, THE SCHOOLS AND CHARACTER FORMATION

The school and social power.

Patterns of schooling are as varied as patterns of culture and may be conceptualized from as many different perspectives. Generally speaking, the philosophy, aims and methods of schooling are determined and legitimated by society. Depending on particular social values, the school experience may emphasize the indoctrination of its individual members according to existing traditions, attitudes and modes of behavior, or it may emphasize the relatively unhindered growth and development of the individual and even sanction social criticism and social innovation from him. (41) These two possible variations have been formulated into two well known philosophies of education: the traditional and the progressive. Although neither has been implemented in pure form in our culture, each has received more or less emphasis at different times. This philosophical polarity is useful to employ in a discussion of mental health and education because it contrasts two themes which are pervasive and conflicting in modern life: the values, needs and demands of the group versus the values, needs and demands of the individual.

Traditional education consists of the systematic, didactic instruction of information and skills, and the indoctrination and discipline of the student according to public standards and rules of conduct. The objectives of this form of education are to prepare the young to meet socially defined responsibilities and to achieve socially defined criteria of success.

Progressive education consists of the more or less free development of the child by means of spontaneous encounters with nature, culture, literature and people. It emphasizes and aims for free activity, learning from experience and the self-differentiation of the individual. (42)

Traditional education aims at the moulding of character along specified patterns, the transmission of cultural lore, attitudes and belief, the teaching of prescribed didactic material and training in occupational skills. Each of these aims and the methods by which they are to be attained are determined in their fundamental design by an agent other than the student, namely by school officials and teachers who represent the wishes of society. Traditional learning, particularly of patterns of conduct, therefore requires repression and inhibition (of socially deviant patterns) which is fostered and supervised by school authorities. It also requires a considerable degree of docility, compliance, reliance on others to provide learning experiences, and obedience from the student. Progressive education, on the other hand, (purportedly) involves a lesser degree of "imposition from without and above" and therefore at least theoretically, a lesser degree of repression, inhibition and obedience.

The two educational philosophies may thus be distinguished from each other according to the influence exercised by the school on the student. The traditional method involves the employment of social power by the school on behalf of society; the progressive method involves the relative restraint on that power on behalf of the free development of the student. The distinction between traditional and progressive education is therefore balanced on the pivot of social power which when exercised represents education from without and when restrained represents education from within.

With this distinction in mind, we may classify types of psychiatric influence together with types of educational philosophy. This will better enable us to understand the role of mental health practices in the school; and it will permit us to illuminate educational and psychotherapeutic practices by comparing and contrasting them with one another. Psychiatric social control and ethnicizing psychotherapy both employ social power and social authority to influence the student to conform his behavior to socially prescribed patterns of conduct. As a school practice, it therefore must be classified with the traditional philosophy of education. Educative psychotherapy requires the avoidance of the use of social power; as a school practice it therefore must be classified with the progressive philosophy.

Psychiatry as an instrument of socialization and social control in the schools.

The school develops as a supplement to the family and the clan as they have become inadequate to prepare the young for specialized roles in social and economic life. In part, the functions of the school are determined by ideals of adult functioning which vary from culture to culture and from time to time. (43) As a society increases in complexity and refines its conception of itself, its formulations of the aims of schooling will multiply. It should be possible to distinguish as many of these aims as it is possible to distinguish dimensions of adult functioning. Indeed, as Dewey saw, any sophisticated account of the aims and functions of schooling either prescriptively or as they exist, will require the full mobilization of man's knowledge about himself. (44) By and large, such a sophisticated account is only fully articulated by scholars and educational sub-specialists for

purposes of understanding the school in society and for intelligent planning of schooling methods and techniques.

Simpler formulae for expressing the aims of education are necessary for public use. These familiar formulae may be found on any report card, student personnel file or recommendation form. They capture the essential elements of the ideals of socialization in simple language. For instance, "the capacity to get along well with authority" embodies the educational aims of fostering respect for authority, transmitting cultural attitudes and rules of conduct and even creating a spirit of patriotism; "the capacity to get along well with peers" captures the goal of forming social skills which are necessary for harmonious participation in social life; "the development of good work habits" represents the aim of providing training in occupational skills and stimulating the traits of creativity and innovation. Academic grades codify success or failure in acquiring information about the physical and social environment and developing skills in reasoning and so on.

Simplified formulae for expressing the aims of education also serve as a shorthand device for evaluating the student. Such evaluations may serve two purposes. First, they may be used to call attention to areas of the student's development which require special attention or remedial work. Second, they may be used as a condensed assessment by which to judge his fitness for adult roles. This is, in a sense, an extra service which the schools provide in a competitive society which pays the bill and demands a high degree of social conformity, skill and talent for specialized jobs. Thus, we must distinguish two different uses of the school by society; first, the school is used as a moulder of character; second, it is used as a judge

of character. In the first case, the school serves both the individual and society as ethnicizer by preparing the young for adult life. In the second case, the school serves society as an instrument of social control and personnel management by certifying youth as ready for adult social and economic roles, by screening potential employees for social, governmental and commercial groups and by filtering out and refusing to certify those who fail to meet socially acceptable standards of performance. These two functions of the school have predominated over the function of the school as an educator and is the primary reason that the philosophy of traditional education has prevailed over the philosophy of progressive education.

It is in the context of these functions of the modern school that the role of the psychiatrist must be conceptualized. His primary role is to serve the school and society as an ethnicizer and an instrument of social power.

The vast majority of students who come to the attention of school psychiatrists, particularly in primary and secondary schools do not initiate the consultation. They are, in other words, involuntary patients, through overt or subtle pressure. Most often, they are brought to the psychiatrist by a school official, usually the teacher, the guidance counsellor or the dean. This means that before the student is diagnosed as mentally ill he has been identified troubled or troublesome by the school: he has demonstrated deviance from the ideals of schooling.

Anyone who is identified as a problem student may be referred to the psychiatrist. The following traits exemplify the student as a problem: sadness, elation or self-absorption; suicidal ideas, threats, gestures or

attempts; restlessness or apathy and indifference; truancy, vandalism, theft, cheating, plagiarism or other delinquency; the use of drugs or sexual deviations; under-achievement or over-achievement; peer group problems and disobedience to authority. (45,46) This list demonstrates the fundamental similarity of psychiatric diagnoses to judgments of social deviance (in contrast to medical diagnoses which are independent of such judgments.). It also illustrates the fact that the mental health ethic derives from the same cultural values which delineate the ideal of character development in the schools and society. (19,47) Behavior which has traditionally been defined as immoral, criminal, inept, undesirable or obnoxious has come to be defined in crypto-moral psychiatric terms; indeed the psychiatric "diagnosis" which is probably most frequently used in the schools, namely "character disorder" may be used to classify any individual who deviates from any ideal of social deportment.

At the same time, behavior which formerly called for criminal prosecution, suspension, punishment or remedial work is now often handled instead by a call for psychiatric intervention. However, close examination of these interventions will demonstrate them to be more similar to those taken by the school than to those taken by medical physicians. Thus, one of the functions of the psychiatrist is to assist the school to screen students who are judged to lack the character to receive the diploma which entitles them to enter into the higher levels of economic life. De-selection may be accomplished by declaring a student to be mentally ill and in need of (involuntary) psychiatric hospitalization or other institutional placement. Or, the school authorities, with the psychiatrist's advice or approval, may suspend the student with the recommendation that he receives psychiatric

care. In other cases, the psychiatrist may justify suspending a student as necessary for the mental health of others.

These actions alleviate the school's problems with a student by removing him from the premises. They are equivalent to non-psychiatric expulsion from school in every important respect except two: the action is usually defined as for the benefit of the student because he is suffering from "mental illness"; and the school's function of denying certification is disguised by the rhetoric of medicine.

Another function performed by the psychiatrist is to assist the school to evaluate students. These evaluations may be used to accept or reject an applicant, to promote a student, to require remedial work or for other administrative decisions. They become a part of the student's dossier and may be used to make recommendations to future employers, to more advanced schools or to governmental agencies, for instance which request information for security clearance purposes. As an expert in evaluating human behavior, the psychiatrist thus assists the school in its task as a personnel screening agency for society.

In most cases the combined power of the psychiatrist and the school are brought to bear on the troubled or troublesome student to alter his behavior: to provide supplementary ethnicizing experiences. This is accomplished by means of (ethnicizing) psychotherapy, by counselling, by special classes, by group therapy, by conferring with his family, his teacher or other school officials about how they may influence the youngster. Sometimes, the student will be required to enter psychotherapy as a condition for remaining in school. In other instances, administrative investigations or penalties may be dropped as a reward for the student who demonstrates a zeal

for self-correction by entering psychotherapy. The power of the psychiatrist to soil the student's personnel file, to recommend suspension from school, to communicate with the school administration, the police, prospective employers and governmental agencies is a strong factor towards influencing the student.

Finally, the psychiatrist is often called upon to confer with college personnel: the deans, the library staff, the college police, the financial officers, the registrar, dormitory advisors, chaplains, medical physicians, teachers and counsellors. In these conferences, his function is to advise on matters of administrative policy, personnel management and even curriculum planning in order to help avoid crisis situations and undue stress, in order to foster the conditions for the optimum development of the student's personality and in order to " ... improve the level of mental health of everyone connected with the institution." (46,p.20)

In addition to the socio-historical factors which have stimulated the general expansion of psychiatric practices, the dynamics of the modern school account for the increasing prominence of mental health programs. Students are quick to perceive that the social power of the school is employed in the service of social order and social needs. They become aware that the school may exert a strong influence on their social and economic destiny either by certifying them for participation in the adult world or by denying them this certificate and defacing them. The power of the school is an important instrument in the socialization of some students; those with ambition and opportunity may be strongly motivated to conform their behavior to the ideals and standards of the school. Indeed, the possibility of failing scholastically or as a person and consequently of being rejected by the "college or employer of one's choice," is a source of great anxiety to ambitious students. Often, they learn how to play a clever con-game in which they collect a blotless personnel folder, an image of ideal social adjustment

and a high grade average, by cheating if necessary. Meanwhile, the turbulent drama of their lives is driven under-ground into a separate sphere with which all are acquainted by whispered publicity, but which is accessable to the influence of neither education nor social control.

Often, schooling occurs in the context of open antagonism between the student and the school. This is particularly true for "outsider" groups such as oppressed minorities and the poor. Individuals from these groups often see compulsory schooling as captivity in an alien system which tantalizes them with promises of opportunity, demands conformity and offers contempt, degradation and the scraps of an affluent society. If the antagonism between the teacher (and his main group of identification) and the student (and his main group of identification) has become a public event, for instance as has occurred in many localities between Negro and white, then the school experience becomes a thinly disguised civil war; and the insurgent students are then often defined as culturally deprived and emotionally disturbed and in need of "special help." Even in a homogenous school the unredeeming power of the school over the student is often the occasion for his rebellion, as the contemporary epidemic of school vandalism will testify; or it is this occasion for his apathy, as the statistics on dropouts will testify.

All of the complexities, absurdities and difficulties of growing up in the modern world come to a focus in the classroom. (48,49,50,23) However, teachers as well as students are unprepared to deal with rapid social change, challenges to traditional codes of conduct and the cultural intricacies of modern life and modern education. This is manifested in their own uncertainty

about how to maintain discipline, how to advise students on moral matters and how best to guide their character development. The numerous and multiplying fads in behavioral science and psychology tend to undermine the teacher's sense of confidence to tread where the experts themselves seem to be confused and in conflict. In addition, the combination of rapid population growth, the importance of education for employment and income, the poor salaries of teachers and other factors have resulted in the over-crowding of the classroom and the diminution of personal attention that can be given to the students.

These conditions provide the fertile soil in which psychiatry thrives. In the disguise of another service, the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of mental illness, the "mental health" teams serve as trouble shooters to assist the school in its desperate plight. These teams supply "personal" attention to problem students while the remainder of the student body must be satisfied with the anonymity of the large classroom. They assist indecisive school administrators in the selection and deselection of students. They provide "scientific" criteria for evaluating the student as a person to replace the obsolete standards which lack stature in a technological society. They ethnicize and reform students by employing social power disguised as benevolent medical treatment: no small consolation to schools which recognize the necessity to use social power but are unwilling to use it openly. Finally, as cadres of character development specialists, they guide the bewildered school in all aspects of its task of preparing the young for adult life.

Psychiatry as an instrument of education in the schools.

The psychiatrist functions in the modern school primarily as an instrument of ethnicization and social power. Three facts are responsible for this. First, psychiatrists (indeed, all mental health workers) have generally accepted and sought this as their primary social task. Second, the school psychiatrist is employed and paid by the school (and often therefore, by the state) and is therefore responsible primarily to the school rather than to the student. Third, the main function of the school is to ethnicize and train the young for participation in adult life.

This does not mean that the psychiatrist cannot or could not contribute to the education of students. However, he can make such a contribution in only two ways: as a therapist and as a social scientist. In both cases, certain conditions must prevail for this to be possible. As a therapist, the psychiatrist must exercise no social power over the student. He must under no circumstances practice psychiatric commitment; for if he does, then the possibility that the student-patient may lose his freedom by saying or doing the wrong thing will hang like a pall over the entire relationship and inhibit free discussion. Also, the psychiatrist must practice absolute confidentiality; this means he must communicate with no one about the student, not even at the student's request. The possibility that the therapist may have a beneficial as well as harmful effect on the student's life will foster the suppression, repression and inhibition of thoughts and actions which might work to the student's disadvantage.

Second, the student must be the sole determinant of the goals of therapy to the extent that these goals represent specific actions or arrangements he

may make in his life. It is central to the very concept of education (as the term is defined here) that these actions or arrangements may be judged to be deviant. This does not mean that the therapist sanctions or promotes deviance: it means that he refuses to function as an ethnicizer or a policeman. Other social agents will function in these two roles and if the patient chooses to be deviant it will be their responsibility to apprehend, punish or reform him. The therapist limits his social operations to discussing the student's life with him. The usefulness of the psychiatrist will therefore be measured by the student-patient rather than by the psychiatrist or society.

The discussions between the therapist and the patient constitute a certain kind of educational experience. There are many accounts of the nature of (psychoanalytic) psychotherapy but any account which is to be relevant to schooling must be phrased in socially relevant, ordinary language. In these terms, psychotherapy is an education in the creation of autobiography.

Briefly stated, there are four central elements to autobiographical education. First, there must be a detailed investigation of the individual's history. The significance of this investigation is that for man, historical events serve as precedents for contemporary behavior. To the extent that an individual is unaware of these precedents he is the victim of their automatic (unconscious) influence. To the extent that they are conflicting, stereotyped and limiting, the individual's current behavior will be conflictual, stereotyped and inhibited. An awareness of one's history, to paraphrase Santayana, provides the opportunity to set precedents (to act creatively) rather than to follow them. (51)

Second, auto-biographical education elucidates the influences of present context on behavior. (52) The discovery of the situational context of behavior has perhaps been the most important contribution of psychology to the understanding of man. (53,54) The practical uses of this discovery involves acquiring an awareness of the "cultural territory" in which one operates; an awareness of the impact of other persons (including the therapist), groups, ideas and social rules on personal conduct.

The first two elements of educative psychotherapy involve the past (history) and the present (social context). The third involves the influence of the future on the present and the present on the future. Together, these three temporal perspectives take into account the historical and symbolic nature of man for whom past, present and future are bound to each other by action and meaning: his history is fixed and "determining" yet it is created as his present choices recede into the past; and the anticipation of the future may mould his current actions, yet these actions may alter the course of events to come. (55)

In educative psychotherapy one learns about the influences of the future on the present in the sense that real or perceived opportunities, possibilities, limitations and restrictions influence present choices. For instance, a middle-aged widow who sees no possibilities for rounding out the drama of her life as a wife or mother may drift into lethargy and inaction. (31,56) A negro child from a poor family may strike out at representatives of a society which has differentially obstructed opportunities for him to participate in the "American dream." (57)

One function of the study of past, present and future is to gain an

awareness of the manner in which they may restrict current choices so that these restrictions may be counteracted when possible. This is the sense in which educative psychotherapy is psychologically liberating: it aims at maximizing self-control over the limiting conditions of behavior thus increasing the range of possible "uses" to which an individual may put himself.

However, there is more to education than liberation; there is also the development of discipline which enables the enactment of choice. It requires at least as much intelligence, talent and skill to make a personal decision about one's life as it does to fix a car, to paint a canvas or to close a financial deal. In order to make intelligent personal decisions one must be free of intrusive habits, rigid precedents, dogmatic prejudices and absolute maxims; one must also possess the capacity clearly to identify a problem, to assimilate relevant facts, to formulate possible solutions and their consequences, to weigh the relative value of the various solutions in terms of one's biography and to select a course of action without requiring assurance about the correctness of one's choice or the certainty of the outcome. (25)

We have been hypnotized by the modern "science" of personality into believing that the correctness of personal decisions will be assured if only the forces of personality are properly balanced. Intelligence is treated as if it were a naturally acquired, indwelling capacity which is won or lost at the moment when sperm and egg fuse rather than a skill which can be learned and nurtured or suppressed and extinguished by social influence and social power.

Intelligence is a social quality. Whatever social forces encourage automatic responses, conformity to pre-formulated maxims, obedience to authority, repression and inhibition will frustrate the development of intelligence. In this sense, rigid social traditions, a morality of absolute maxims an' attitude of uncritical obedience and the denial of the opportunity for personal encounter are the enemies of intelligence. (1,58) This is the ineluctable contradiction of human existence which must be faced by those who wish to foster both a strong moral consciousness and the capacity for critical intelligence.

The fourth element of auto-biographical education is that it cannot be theoretical and abstract. It involves, in the words of John Dewey, "Learning to do by knowing and to know by doing." (59) This means that the student must be permitted the freedom to know and to do. One cannot master the influence on him of social forces which he cannot identify, verbalize, examine and evaluate; nor can he master areas of behavior with which he does not have direct experience. This does not imply that license is a requirement for learning. It does imply that the possibilities for education are maximized in an open society governed by rule of law in which education and social control are clearly separated enterprises. Conversely, educational possibilities are reduced under totalitarian political conditions and under conditions in which the educator functions primarily as an ethnicizer and an agent of social control.

This form of psychotherapy may thus be viewed as an educational experience by means of which an individual learns to apply the methods of science to the problems of his personal conduct. (35) It is a specialized response to

the troubled individual of the modern age who does not find traditional moral guidelines to be satisfactory and who has not developed skills in autonomous choice-making with which to replace them.

This view of educative psychotherapy suggests three relevant questions about the modern school. First, if an education in the creation of autobiography is useful to some, would it not be useful to all who must cope with the complexities of modern social life? Is it not possible to provide this educative experience more broadly through schooling? Second, how is it possible to reconcile the incompatible conditions for ethnicization and education in the school since the former requires the use of social power and the latter requires the restraint of it? Third, how can this kind of educative experience be incorporated into the school program?

When we de-medicalize the rhetoric of psychiatry it becomes apparent that the ideal of "mental health" is actually an ideal of adult social functioning; and the concern about the relationship of mental health to the schools is actually a concern about the aims and methods of character development in the school. The alternatives posed are: The extent to which the schools should function to develop character according to certain specific moral standards which are determined by public policy versus the extent to which they should assist the individual to develop flexible capacities for choice-making and to guide his own conduct on the basis of his own autonomous judgments. To the extent that the latter course is selected at all, then the benefits of educational psychotherapy should be extended beyond the private consulting room and given the widest possible distribution. In this case, the psychiatrist should function as a social scientist, to study the problems

of the individual in the modern world and to give this knowledge the widest possible distribution.

There are basic similarities between ethnicizing psychotherapy and traditional education on the one hand and between educative psychotherapy and progressive education on the other. Lessons learned about human nature from psychotherapy may have relevance to the school situation and vice-versa. For instance, it has been learned that people who have not achieved a certain degree of ethnicization are not candidates for (cannot engage in) educative psychotherapy. (60) Simply stated, this implies that an individual must be ethnicized, he must have a minimum capacity to participate in social life, before he can be educated, before he can engage in sophisticated refinements of choice. This means that traditional (ethnicizing) and progressive (educative) schooling are not poised as mutually exclusive alternatives. They represent an increasingly differentiated hierarchy of development in which the former is a prerequisite for the latter.

The serious question therefore is not which to choose but whether or not an educative experience will be provided at all. The main task of childhood is to learn to be a member of the culture in which one lives. No matter how "spontaneous" a child's early experiences may be, as long as he grows up in a social group he will not escape from being influenced by adults whom he will attempt to emulate, please, anger and disobey. If the standards of the adult are not made explicit, then the child will merely have to struggle harder to identify and respond to them. Nevertheless, he will learn their language, their customs, their prejudices, their taboos and their idols. The learning of social skills is inseparable from learning the particular ethnic context in which they are used. Therefore, a degree of repression

and inhibition always accompanies a child's learning of the fundamental social skills of communication and social deportment. The child who develops without repression and inhibition will not be a socialized member of his community. He will be unsocialized and inept or anti-social and deviant. In either case his ability to engage in more complicated social choices will be crippled.

The relationship between ethnicization and education is much like the relationship between discipline and creativity in science, art and the crafts. The scientist must be well trained in the theory and technique of his field before he can engage in independent research; the artist must first discipline himself in the use of his materials before he can employ them creatively; and the navigator must first master the use of navigational equipment, the handling of vessels and the science of the seas before he can sail to the port of his choice. In each case, the individual must learn the capabilities and limitations of his medium within the boundaries of which he functions. The discipline in these areas of learning is simply a more specialized version of the discipline involved in ethnicization. The medium of human conduct is the social transaction, in which one must be disciplined and skilled in order to be able to exercise his freedom and creativity. (It should not be surprising therefore, that attempts to soften the use of authority and discipline create more problems than they solve. (61))

The necessity of authority and discipline for ethnicization has become transformed into a moral virtue which is more often used against the individual in the service of the ideology of the state than it is used in the service of human development. However, the problems of the individual in anomic,

rapidly changing mass society suggest that learning the skills of autonomous choice-making is also a necessity for his survival. For those who accept this necessity, the controversy between the traditional and progressive theories of schooling should be transformed into one of timing. When is it appropriate to shift the school experience from one which is primarily ethnicizing to one which is primarily educative: i.e., at what point should the school relinquish its function as ethnicizer and agent of social control?

Whether this should occur at the junior high, the high school or the college level is open for discussion. Certainly, if we wish our laws to be relevant to our social life, the age of majority should be considered to be the appropriate point of transformation. Prior to this point, the school should function openly as an ethnicizer, employing its social power to "brief" the young in the rules of social life. Of course, preparation for the final goal of autonomy may be included in this phase of character development just as preparation for making complicated moves in chess may be included in the learning of the rules governing the use of chessmen. However, it is inevitable that ethnicization will also foster conflict, repression, inhibition and self-doubt.

A period of education or cultural "debriefing" should therefore follow. The principles of educative psychotherapy permit us to specify the necessary conditions for this experience. First, the school must exercise no social power over the student. This means the abandonment of the principle of "in. loco parentis" which literally continues the ethnicization (and infantilization) of the young adult. The influence of the power of the

school on the learning process has been insufficiently studied (for obvious reasons); however, there is reason to believe that just as the social power of the parent fosters repression and inhibition in the child, so the social power of the school also fosters these and therefore interferes with its alleged aim of encouraging free inquiry. Schooling is an extremely personal process no matter how bureaucratized and massified modern public education has become. The power exercised by teachers and school officials over students will have a dominating influence on their thought and action (either in the direction of conformity or rebellion); and efforts to master the influence of social power will be overshadowed by the influence of that power itself. The laws of the land should be sufficient to regulate the student's behavior. Attempts to supplement or evade these laws with administrative rules only promotes ignorance and disrespect for law.

Second, the school which wishes to provide educative experiences must cease serving commercial, military governmental and social interests by maintaining surveillance and dossiers on student conduct. Such a system of spying, let us call it by its proper name, is a subtle method for controlling the student who wishes to enter these areas of life upon completion of his career. These interests should be capable of evaluating prospective employees without the aid of the school; and the student should be free to decide for himself that he wishes to be helped with his personal problems.

Third, at this point in his life, the student should be free to make his own living arrangements according to his personal preferences and styles and subject to the control only of legitimate social authority. The school

should not regulate or judge his grooming, his personal associations, his sexual practices, his use of alcohol or drugs, or any other aspect of his behavior. Like the educative psychotherapist, the school should limit its function to undoing repressions and inhibitions: to refining the student's perceptions of his life and expanding his capacities to choose and act.

Fourth, the curriculum should be designed to provide the student with a commanding perspective on his social world. The burden of this task of course, falls on the social sciences and humanities; and the formulation of such a curriculum is no doubt the major task of educational research. If it is to serve an educative function, such a program must have the same intellectual orientation as educative psychotherapy, albeit on a cultural rather than an auto-biographical level.

First, it must be oriented to contemporary problems rather than to faddist and abstract disciplinary conventions. Second, it must provide an historical orientation to these problems (contemporary history.) This serves the same function as the investigation of personal history in educative psychotherapy: to provide an awareness of culturally conditioned influences on conduct. Third, it must conceptualize contemporary problems in terms of world issues, cultural context and social situation of the particular students involved <u>in their relationship to one another</u>. Fourth, it must include the future dimensions of life by providing an understanding of the biological basis of choice and meaning, the influence of social authority and social power on behavior and the application of scientific thinking to problems of conduct.

In its basic design such an educative program embodies the principles, aims and methods of educative (psychoanalytic) psychotherapy. It represents the broadest possible implementation of the principles of mental health in the school situation in the sense that the ideal of mental health and the ideal of character development both refer to the acquisition of refined self-knowledge and self-mastery of one's social performance. (62) Of course, certain individuals may wish a more personal educative experience, but this would constitute a supplement and not a substitute for educative schooling.

EPILOGUE

The social conditions which are responsible for the alienation of modern man are also responsible for his freedom: the loss of community and primary affiliative structures and the rise of the industrial democracy. The search for an antidote to alienation has often involved the organization of social life under the dominion of the state and the collective. Although social cohesion is no doubt increased at times by social power and social authority, there is reason to question whether the harmony and integrity of communal life can be retrieved by the exercise of government power in a heterogeneous, complex world society. There is no doubt that human freedom can be extinguished by the use of that power.

We must not forget that the schools accomplish their task of forming and reforming character in part, by employing (state sanctioned) social power. The invasion of the schools by psychiatric "mental health teams" is also an instance of the use of state sanctioned power to promote social order, to ethnicize the young and to buttress vanishing moral ideals. As

is to be expected in an age of science and humanism, this power is disguised as scientifically grounded and humanistically motivated. Power is power, and while it is necessary for rearing the young it should not pose for something other than it is. There are disadvantages to the use of social power the most notable of which are the loss of freedom and dignity and the inculcation of attitudes of obedience and slavishness. Therefore, to be intelligently utilized that power should be open and recognized rather than covert and disguised.

One major antidote to the disruptive effects of alienation is the educational experience in which the individual is informed of his predicament and is provided with the skills to function as a social unit in a complex society. While it is evident that this education is becoming increasingly indispensable to the individual, the reason for our failure to provide it for him are also evident.

The transmission of moral values has long been conceived as one of the main functions of the school. The failure of a school to vigorously indoctrinate its students in prevailing moral values, or to prosecute deviance from those values is often cited by citizens groups and government officials as subversive to social cohesion and social order. However, such indoctrination, if pursued to the exclusion of a period of debriefing, will tend to duplicate precisely those conditions which incapacitate the individual in the modern world: it will make him the victim rather than the master of the conflicts and disharmonies of his culture, it will inculcate repression and inhibition in critical areas of conduct and it will encourage an attitude of unreflective obedience to authoritative social influences.

The repugnance and opposition both to psychoanalysis and to "educative" schooling therefore, stem from a persistent commitment to traditional morality and from a commitment to a meta-ethic of obedience (group values) rather than to a meta-ethic of autonomous, intelligent choice-making (individual values.) This demonstrates that education, in its basic design, is not morally neutral: on the contrary, just as in analytic psychotherapy the aim is to eliminate the automatic, compulsive influence of the super-ego on conduct, so in analytic education the aim is to eliminate the automatic, compulsive influence of cultural values and social power on conduct.

This is the psychological dimension of the old conflict between the values and needs of the individual and the values and needs of society. From this point of view, education is potentially socially subversive in that it involves a challenge to the authority of conventional social guidelines and it involves the development of the capacity for disobedience to all that is sacred in the social order. This conflict is both obscured and intensified by the rhetoric of mental health. Mental health either represents the adoption of specific moral qualities which are congenial to social order in which case it is incompatible with self-control and self-direction: or it represents the capacity for self-control and self-direction, in which case it is incompatible with maximum social order and security. The pursuit of one or another of these themes is implied in the choice between traditional and progressive schooling. And the pursuit of one or the other of these themes will indicate whether the psychiatrist functions in the school as the agent of society or the agent of the individual.

REFERENCES

1. Durkheim, Emile, (1897) Suicide, George Simpson, Ed., Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.
2. Mannheim, Karl, (1922) Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1936.
3. Szasz, Thomas S., (1957) Pain and Pleasure. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
4. Szasz, Thomas S., (1961) The Myth of Mental Illness. New York: Paul B. Hoeber.
5. Caplan, Gerald, (1964) Principles of Preventive Psychiatry. New York: Basic Books.
6. Duhl, Leonard J., (1963) "The Changing Face of Mental Health," In The Urban Condition. Leonard Duhl, (Editor), New York: Basic Books.
7. Szasz, Thomas S., (1963) Law, Liberty and Psychiatry. New York: The Macmillan Co.
8. Zrull, Joel P., (1966) "An Experience in Developing a Program of Consultation with a County Board of Education," J. Amer. Acad. Child Psychiat., Vol. 5, No. 3, (July), pp. 490-493.
9. Adams, Robert S. and Weinick, Howard M., (1966), "An Inservice Training Program for the School," J. Amer. Acad. Child Psychiat., Vol. 5, No. 3, (July) pp. 479-489.
10. Shore, Milton, F. and Massimo, Joseph L. (1966) "Comprehensive Vocationally Oriented Psychotherapy for Adolescent Delinquent Boys," Am. J. Orthopsychiat., Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 609-615.

11. Stogdill, Charles G., (1965) "Mental Health in Education," Amer. J. Psychiat., Vol. 121, No. 7, (Jan.), pp. 694-698.

12. Szasz, Thomas S., (1963) "Psychoanalytic Treatment as Education," Arch. Gen. Psychiat., Vol. 9, (July), pp. 46-52.

13. Devereaux, George, (1956) Therapeutic Education. New York: Harper and Brothers.

14. King, Lester, (1954) "What is Disease?" Phil. Sci., (July), Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 193-203.

15. Beqiraj, Mehmet, (1966) Peasantry in Revolution. Ithaca: Center For International Studies, Cornell University.

16. Nisbet, Robert A., (1962) Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press.

17. Diamond, Stanley, (1963) "The Search for the Primitive," In Man's Image In Medicine and Anthropology. New York: International Universities Press.

18. Kahler, Erich, (1957) The Tower and the Abyss. New York: George Braziller Co.

19. Davis, Kingsley, (1938) "Mental Hygiene and the Class Structure," Psychiat., Vol. 1, (February), pp. 55-65.

20. Hollingshead, August and Redlich, Fredrick C., (1958) Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: John Wiley.

21. Leifer, Ronald, (1966) "Community Psychiatry and Social Power," Social Problems, Vol. 14, No. 1, (Summer), pp. 16-22.

22. Devereaux, George, (1939) "A Sociological Theory of Schizophrenia," Psychoan Rev., Vol. 26, (June), pp. 315-342.

23. Goodman, Paul, (1962) Growing Up Absurd: Problems of Youth in the Organized Society. New York: Random House.

24. Benedict, Ruth, (1938) "Continuities and Discontinuities in Cultural Conditioning," Psychiat., Vol. 1, No. 2, (May), pp. 161-169.

25. Dewey, John, (1929) The Quest for Certainty. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

26. Menninger, Karl, (1961) Theory of Psychoanalytic Technique. New York: Science Editions.

27. Freud, Sigmund, (1936) The Problem of Anxiety. Henry Alden Bunker, Transl. New York: W.W. Norton.

28. Becker, Ernest, (1964) The Revolution in Psychiatry. New York: The Free Press.

29. Szasz, Thomas S., (1965) The Ethics of Psychoanalysis. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

30. Wheelis, Allen, (1958) The Quest For Identity. New York: W.W. Norton, Inc.

31. Becker, Ernest, (1963) "Social Science and Psychiatry: The Coming Challenge," Antioch Rev., Fall, 1963.

32. Leifer, Ronald, (1966) "Avoidance and Mastery: An Interactional View of Phobias," J. Individ. Psychol., Vol. 22, No. 1, (May), pp. 80-93.

33. Breuer, Joseph and Freud, Sigmund, (1893-5) "Studies in Hysteria," In The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. James Strachey, Ed., Vol. II, London: Hogarth Press, 1955, p. 160.

34. Freud, Sigmund, (1927) "Postscript to a Discussion on Lay Analysis." In Collected Papers of Sigmund Freud. James Strachey, Ed., London: Hogarth Press, 1956.

35. Leifer, Ronald, (1966) "Psychotherapy, Scientific Method and Ethics." Amer. J. Psychother., Vol. 20, No. 2, (April), pp. 295-304.

36. Becker, Ernest, (1962) The Birth and Death of Meaning. New York: The Free Press.

37. Riesman, David, Glaser, Nathan, Reuel, Denny, (1955) The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

38. Fromm, Erich, (1944) "Individual and Social Origins of Neurosis." Amer. Sociol. Rev., Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 380-384.

39. Dewey, John, (1922) Human Nature and Conduct. New York: Henry Holt.

40. Sartre, Jean-Paul, (1963) Saint Genet: Actor and Martyr. New York: George Braziller.

41. Brim, Orville G., Jr., (1958) Sociology and the Field of Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

42. Dewey, John, (1938) Experience and Education. New York: Collier Books, 1963.

43. Durkheim, Emile, (1956) Education and Sociology. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

44. Dewey, John, (1930) "From Absolutism to Experimentalism." In Contemporary American Philosophy. G.P. Adams and W.P. Montague, Eds., New York: Macmillan.

45. Radin, Sherwin S., (1962) "Mental Health Problems in School Children." J. School Health., Vol. 32, pp. 390-397.

46. Farnsworth, Dana L. (1966) Psychiatry, Education and the Young Adult. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.

47. Miller, S.M. and Riessman, Frank, (1964) "Social Change Versus The 'Psychiatric World View'." Am. J. Orthopsychiat., Vol. 34, No. 1, (January), pp. 29-38.

48. Keniston, Kenneth, (1963) "Alienation and the Decline of Utopia." In Varieties of Modern Social Theory. Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek, Ed., New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc.

49. Henry, Jules, (1965) Culture Against Man. New York: Vintage Books.

50. Friedenberg, Edgar, (1965) Coming of Age in America. New York: Random House.

51. Fingarette, Herbert, (1963) The Self in Transformation. New York: Basic Books.

52. Szasz, Thomas S., (1963) "The Concept of Transference." Int. J. Psychoanal. Vol. 44, No. 4, pp. 432-443.

53. Mills, C. Wright, (1940) "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive." In Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills. Irving Louis Horowitz, Ed. New York: Ballantine Books.

54. Mead, George Herbert, (1956) The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead. Anselm Strauss, Ed., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

55. Diamond, Stanley, (1964) "What History Is." In Process and Pattern in Culture. Robert A. Manners, Ed., Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

56. Becker, Ernest, (1962) "Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Depression." J. Nerv. Ment. Dis. Vol. 135, No. 1, (July), pp. 26-35.

57. Merton, Robert K., (1938) "Social Structure and Anomie." American Sociol. Rev., Vol. 3, No. 5, (October), pp. 672-682.

58. Dewey, John, (1920) Reconstruction in Philosophy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

59. Dewey, John and McClellan, James Alexander, (1889) Applied Psychology. Boston: Educational Publishing Company.

60. Szasz, Thomas S., (1957) "A Contribution to the Psychology of Schizophrenia." A.M.A. Arch. Neurol. Psychiat., Vol. 77, (April), pp. 420-436.

61. Arendt, Hanna, (1963) "The Crisis in Education." In Varieties of Modern Social Theory. Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek, Ed., New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

62. Becker, Ernest, (1963) "Personality Development in the Modern World: Beyond Freud and Marx." In Education and the Development of Nations. Syracuse, Syracuse University Press.

CITIZENSHIP OR CERTIFICATION

Thomas Green

I

In the past eighty years or so of American history there have occurred at least two important transformations in the role and conception of schools and schooling. The first developed when the conception of educating the public became closely linked to public school education so that the education of the public tended to become coextensive with the conception of public schooling. Jefferson argued that "if a nation expects to be free and ignorant in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never shall be," and this remark is often taken to express the fundamental necessity upon which the American system of schooling rests. This basic axiom is one way of expressing the conviction that whatever else education may accomplish, its fundamental purpose is political. Its most basic contribution is in the formation of a democratic public; its most important goal, the development of citizens. But not even in his famous proposal to the Virginia legislature did Jefferson express the belief that formal schooling would become the primary instrument in the education of the public. By way of public schooling, Jefferson proposed to offer three years of grammar school for "every white child of the Commonwealth," more advanced education for some promising ones, and free higher education for a very select group, which he referred to as "the natural aristocracy." That is not as extensive a proposal for public schooling as we might expect from a man who believed so strongly in the political importance of educating the public.

For Jefferson, the most fundamental function of education was defined in relation to the formation of a civic body. But he clearly distinguished between education and schooling. The basic skills transmitted through the common grammar school were to be the necessary prerequisites rather than the definition of one's education. Thus schooling, though necessary, was less important in educating the public than participation in the polity and the economy. Political participation and a free press, these were the primary means of educating the public. Not even for the generation of Horace Mann did the demand for mass education imply mass schooling over increasingly extended periods of one's life. Schooling and education were not synonymous. "Education" was the more comprehensive term and was tied directly to the formation of a civic order.

In the same light consider the underlying function of education in the American encounter with immigrant groups. The "common school" undoubtedly played a large role in the process of assimilation. Mass education was required to reduce the dangers of cultural pluralism. The function of the common school was, among other things, to tone down cultural differences and equip the immigrant with an historical memory which would allow him to find his identity as an American. This educational goal was pursued through many kinds of schooling at many age levels, but it was never understood to require mass schooling over very extended periods of time. The process of assimilation, was aided, moreover, even at the outset, by the fact that participation in the economy and the polity often required the immigrant to

shed some of his distinctive behavior in favor of what was more functional in American society. And so, not even in the process of assimilation was the mass education of the public focused in mass schooling. It was assumed throughout that, quite apart from schooling, there were many ways of securing an education, many agencies of education, and a variety of paths to dignified adult status and full-fledged membership in the public body. A richly diversified pattern of educating the public was understood to exist and schooling was but a small part of it.

The first significant shift in these assumptions occurred, or at least became evident, in the first two decades of the present century. Dewey, for example, clearly recognized that education and schooling are not the same thing. He argued that all of life is educative in the sense that every experience has consequences in developing habits and therefore in bringing pattern to the release of human impulse in action. Some experiences, however, can be miseducative because they tend to develop patterns of habit which are restricting rather than liberating. They tend to minimize the subsequent capacity of the child to respond appropriately to a changing environment. The only proper solution, he thought, was to develop the habits of intelligence, the habits of reflection which alone are sufficient to adjust the pattern of human action to changing circumstances without limit. Education was growth and whatever tended to limit the capacity to grow was miseducative.

Dewey's complaint, was that many of the agencies of deliberate education were not doing their job. The process of industrialization had contributed to the decay of the family and the education of the church was either ineffective

or inherently damaging in the process of developing people who would participate in a democratic society. Neither they nor the press, unions, neighborhoods or shops were effective in educating properly. Some other institution must take on their educative functions. It became almost a folk assumption that this institution should be the school. It was Dewey's view not that the school played too large a role in the education of the public, but that its role was too narrow. He did not deny that there were other forces for education, but he turned constantly to the school as the best hope for assembling the educational resources necessary for the preservation of a democratic public.

On this view it became increasingly difficult to separate the education of the public from the institutions of public schooling. The function of schooling was no less political in conception, no less directed toward a civic ideal, but the role of schooling in education was greatly expanded. Jefferson's assumptions concerning the political necessity of educating the public were retained, but in achieving those ends, the sphere of schools and schooling was greatly expanded. This represents a substantial shift in emphasis.

The second transformation in the conception of schooling is more radical. It is also more recent, and for that reason alone is more difficult to define and will require more extensive exploration. The fundamental point is that as the role of schooling in the education of the public is expanded and institutional differentiation proceeds, it may turn out that schools take on not simply enlarged, but entirely different responsibilities. As their importance grows, their actual social function may be transformed. As such a change occurs moreover, it would not be unexpected if the course of social

development would out-run the ideology which is intended to provide the rationalization for schools and schooling. The traditional rationalization, though continually appealed to, would no longer reflect what actually is done in schools and through schooling. It is precisely this kind of transformation that has occurred in American schools and in American society. At least that is the thesis I wish to explore.

Let us recognize, to begin with, that education, wherever it is found is always concerned with three fundamental functions. Education is always concerned with (1) socialization, (2) cultural transmission, and (3) the development of self-identity in the individual. These functions, of course, overlap, but I think it well to treat them as conceptually distinct. By "socialization" i mean to focus on the structural aspects of society and the process of inducting the young into the adult roles of the society structurally defined. By "cultural transmission" I mean to emphasize the value component of society and the process of learning, adopting, and adapting the beliefs and values which provide some rationalization for the social norms and practices which the child learns. By "the development of personal identity", I mean to focus upon two fundamental but discriminable requirements of education. The first is the demand for some meaningful participational roles in a contemporary community, and the second is the necessity for a sense of identity in some historical community. It seems to me a proposition in no need of demonstration that schools, wherever they exist should be the institutions through which society seeks deliberately to advance the social functions of education. That is to say simply that schools should be educational institutions. Whatever their role may be, it must be defined in relation to these purposes of education.

The scope of formal schooling was relatively slight in the mind of Jefferson and was not greatly enlarged in the assimilation of ethnic minorities because the social functions of education could be satisfied in other ways than by formal schooling. The process of socialization did not require extensive schooling. Adult roles in the polity and the economy were readily accessable through other means. They were accessible to those with common or elementary education. Self-identity through some vocation could be achieved without extensive formal preparation and cultural transmission, being frequently regional and ethnic, was accomplished through a myriad of local arrangements, folk clubs, trade associations, Sunday schools, and national celebrations such as Independence Day. Extensive schooling is simply unnecessary in such a society in order to satisfy the functions of education.

But we no longer have that kind of society. We are passing from an industrial to a technological society, from a rural to an urban society, and from an individualistic to a corporate and highly organized society. The process of socialization is different. The role of cultural transmission does not occur with the same clarity and the path to a clear historical and meaningful contemporary identity is not as easy. Now the adult social roles defined in the economy and the polity are heavily loaded with technical prerequisites, and the satisfaction of those prerequisites requires extensive schooling. Consider an example, which is in many ways paradigmatic. Not long ago Governor Rockefeller vetoed an act of the New York State legislature which would require a college degree as a prerequisite for certification as a mortician in New York State. Had he allowed the act to become law, then

access to the position of mortician in New York State would have been unavailable to anyone except through schooling. Again, it was at one time possible for a farmer, for example, to "read law" under an attorney and then through examination, gain admission to the Bar. Abraham Lincoln did not have a law degree. That was not then the normal method of becoming an attorney. He read law as a clerk. This path for entrance into the profession is now virtually closed. "Reading law" now takes the form of schooling undertaken in pursuit of a law degree. Most law clerks, a virtually vanishing breed, must ~~not~~ have law degrees. Schooling is becoming an increasingly pervasive path in the process of socialization. Not even by joining the Army can one avoid the necessity for schooling as the means of gaining access to adult social roles in American society.

The point I wish to stress is that under these conditions, the actual social functions of schooling became transformed. Schooling was an important part of the process of developing a democratic society, but it was only a part, one among many alternative paths to adult social roles. Now it has become very nearly the <u>sole</u> path for gaining access to full-fledged adult membership in American society. The result is that the schools have had to assume a heavier burden of certain functions which heretofore were accomplished in other ways. Schools have had to assume a heavier share in the task of certifying, sorting and selecting, the self-conscious process of determining who will assume which kinds of positions in the work force and which will receive which forms of subsequent education.

The impact of this change is perhaps most vividly seen in the so-called "drop-out problem." It seems to me a sobering fact that prior to 1950 there was no drop-out problem in the schools of this country, not because everyone finished twelve years of school but because we did not define the failure to do so as a problem, There were youngsters who left the formal school system, but we did not view this as a serious matter because there were other ways available for a person to develop his powers and to demonstrate his capacities. A drop-out from school did not mean in any sense a drop-out from society. The term "drop-out" is a fairly recent addition to the vocabulary of education. It does not reflect an increase in the number of youngsters who fail to finish high-school. In fact the proportion of students who fail to finish twelve years of school is probably less now than ever before. The use of the term to designate an important social problem reflects a profound shift in our conception of schooling and in our understanding of the social functions of the schools. The "drop-out" problem can become a problem only if we adopt the view that the fundamental function of schooling is to meet the "man-power needs" of the economic and military institutions of our society. The failure of students to complete their education through high school did not, in fact, become defined as a problem until the school system began to be widely viewed in this way. In short, the growing authority of the schools to perform the function of certifying and sorting has transformed a drop-out from school into a drop-out from society. Failure in school has become one way in which society has learned to say to many young people that they are simply no good.

The important point, however, is that the schools have been made to

assume a greater share of the task of certifying, sorting and selecting. The point is not that this is a new function in American society. What is new is that the task is so heavily bound up with the powers of schools and schooling. It is equally important, however, that this change in the function of schooling has carried with it corresponding changes in the assumptions within which we tend to understand the purpose of schooling. An emphasis upon the certifying function has led to a deemphasis on the political function. The purposes of schooling have tended to be defined less in relation to the formation of a body politic, less in relation to a civic ideal, and more in relation to the "manpower" demands of our economic and military institutions. In short, if there is some tension between the idea of schooling for citizenship and schooling for certification, then in American schools, we have tended to move away from the former in favor of the latter. This constitutes a trully radical departure from the assumptions about the function of schools held either by Jefferson or by the leaders of the Progressive Movement such as Dewey. It means in effect that the connection between public schooling and the education of the public is broken.

It might be argued that I have provided a distorted view of the transformation of the role of American schools. If the schools have had to assume a heavier share in the tasks of certifying, sorting, and selecting and a lesser share in educating a public, that is due simply to a transformation in the economic structure of American society. That is a consequence of the schools reacting appropriately to a transforming job structure in society. The

number of unskilled jobs is declining. Increasingly the available adult roles require technical skills and these can be acquired only through schooling, and schooling, moreover, carried on over expanding periods of time. Hence, schooling through high school is a necessity, not because the schools have made it so, but because the nature of the economy quite objectively viewed has made it so.

No doubt these observations are true <u>in some sense</u> and <u>to some extent</u>. But the vital question is "In what sense and to what extent are they true?" It is doubtless true that our society requires more education in order for people to effectively participate in it. But where is the connection between that fact and the conclusion that it must require more formal schooling? The fact is that there is not and <u>in principle</u>, cannot be any close correlation between the actual technical skills acquired through school and the <u>specific</u> technical prerequisite for any particular job. There cannot be any very close relation between the skills required for a particular job and a high school or college diploma. In fact, what is increasingly required in American society is a diploma, a proper note of certification and not a particular set of capacities developed in school. And what that diploma attests to in fact is not a specific set of abilities but a certain measure of dependability, acquiescence and plasticity of personality -- the capacity to take directions and to be punctual. These are important qualities to develop for participation in the economy, and a diploma or certificate from a school is evidence that they have been developed. But this, which the schools <u>do</u> certify is not a new thing. It does not result from the increasingly technical preprequisites for jobs in American society.

Whether the actual fulfillment of adult roles in modern America in fact needs to require more extended schooling is a highly debatable point. It seems to me doubtful. But the fact is that many people believe it to be true, and if they believe it to be true, however erroneously, it will turn out structurally to be so. If a garageman believes that a good mechanic must have a high school diploma, or a banker that the duties of a teller require a college education, then the fact that their beliefs are mistaken is no comfort to a young person seeking a job without a diploma or degree. He must return to school not to acquire the necessary skills, but to acquire the certification essential in order to gain access to a role where his skills can be displayed. The school in this sense functions as a sorting and certifying agency for admission to adult roles, and this function of the schools is not a consequence of the growing demand for technical skills in the economy. It is a consequence of the way in which we have translated the demand for more education into a demand for more schooling and have as a consequence transformed the role of the school from an institution for the education and development of a civic body into a certifying agency for economic and military purposes.

This then is the second and more radical transformation in the conception of schools and schooling. We began with the assumption that the education of the public was essential because we are a democratic society. Schooling had its role to play in this process, but the purpose of schooling was defined primarily in civic terms. Then through time the role of the school in the formation of the public was enlarged though still related to a civic ideal. Finally, we have managed to expand the role of the public schools to a virtual monopoly in determining access to adult roles in American society. In the

process the civic function of the public schools, their political role in the education of the public has atrophied. This development and its significance may be a consequence of other changes in our society, more fundamental and profound changes in the very conception of the public and of politics. In view of these more fundamental changes, it is an open question whether the schools can really turn from a concern with certification to a more explicit and forthright concern for citizenship.

II

The idea that schools and schooling should be directed toward the formation of a public is a troublesome notion. The concept of a public or civic body, is one of those fruitful ideas at the same time central to the tradition of social thought and amenable to endless change. It is an idea both pregnant and equivocal. And so when it is said that education must be a public affair, what public is it that we have in mind? What do we mean by "public"?

The idea of a public is troublesome, however, not only because it is so slippery, but because it has received so little direct and sustained attention. There are certain resources upon which to draw, but they are perhaps most notable for their inadequacy in modern America. There is, for example, the polis of Aristotle, the space where the heads of families met as equals under no other necessity than their common agreement to speak and to act together. The public in this sense was synonymous with a political body and membership in it required participation in the affairs of that body. Membership in it was indistinguishable from being a political agent and was indispensable to being a human being. Aristotle's famous

principle was not that man is by nature a social being, but that he is by nature a political animal, not that man is by nature simply gregarious, or that he happens to live in the presence of others, but that he is by nature a member of a civic body. The opposite of "public" in this sense would be "non-political" rather than "private". Typically in the ancient world the power of the head, the patria potestas, was without limit. Relations in the family were, by definition, relations among unequals, and so the affairs of the family fell outside the public not because they were private, but because they were non-political. The public then was a political body and education could be conceived in no other context than preparation for entrance into that body of "free and equals". It was natural that both Plato and Aristotle should deal with education within the context of a concern for citizenship, and that they should see the exercise of citizenship as inseparable from the cultivation of both civic and human arete. Education was at once both technical and moral and at the same time civic.

Though the ancient polis remains for us a kind of haunting memory of what we might mean by "the public," nonetheless, it cannot constitute the model of what we mean by that word in discussions of "public education" and "public schools." In the modern city, and certainly in the nation state, to say nothing of a world-wide or regional "family of nations," there is precious little to remind us of the public in the classic sense. Where is the res publica in a modern city, in Chicago or New York for example? Both Plato and Aristotle, as well as others in the ancient world recognized that the polis must be small because it must be intimate and face to face. Indeed that was the problem of Rome, how is it possible to govern an empire

on the model of the civitas? Such a public cannot in principle be expanded beyond limits permitting a meeting of free and equals and a verbal exchange among them.

The polis, insofar, as it provides one model for the meaning of "public," is more closely related to a public defined by the concept of community than a public defined by the concept of society.

The model of societas is that of a social relation founded on contract, a kind of agreement, the result of will, serving sometimes the temporary and sometimes the more durable needs of men. A contractual relation, however, is like a promise. It is something one can enter and from which, therefore, one can be absolved. The concept of society, or societas, was frequently based on the idea that men may be bound together by a "common" interest. But, the word "interest" is a metaphore, a metaphore, moreover, which beautifully belongs to the conception of the public as societas. For an interest, (inter est), understood literally is that which is between two men. It may be understood as that which in coming between them either separates them or joins them. Between the North American continent and Europe there stretches the Atlantic Ocean. Does it separate the continents or unite them? It depends upon one's point of view. From one perspective the ocean is surely an uncluttered highway which connects the two. The point of view of societas is that of separate men who are bound together by a kind of common interest or common fate. But that which unites them, which is between them, is of a different order from kinship or blood, common religion or long and mutually acknowledged historical loyalties. These latter are more of the nature of communitas, for they bind men in a public, a brotherhood as opposed to a partnership, even when their interests diverge. The point is beautifully

put by Tönnies when in Community and Society, he writes,

> The theory of the Gesselschaft deals with the artificial construction of an aggregate of human beings which superficially resembles the Gemeinschaft insofar as the individuals live and dwell together peacefully. However, in Gemeinschaft they remain essentially united in spite of all separating factors, whereas in Gesselschaft they are essentially separated in spite of all uniting factors.[1]

The classical polis does not provide a useful image out of which to build a modern understanding of the "public." The ancient res publica is not much better. Both are essentially political conceptions and the modern understanding of public is not. The latter term, moreover, calls to mind the conception of the legal organization of the public, namely, the state, and that is not what we mean by the public either. The notion of a national society, with its historic relation to social contract theory and the Roman societus is too large and indefinite, too much connected with the idea of polity and too likely to admit many publics in a society without seriously coming to grips with the term "public" at all.

If we are to understand the meaning of "public" in discussions of "public" education, "public" schools, and the education of the "public," then part of what is needed is some symbol of the public adequate to express and to evoke the needed social commitment of our time. What we seek is some formulation of the idea of "public" so that through the process of education men may find it believable that they are in some sense "united in spite of all separating factors." In that respect, our understanding of a public

---

1. Community and Society. Charles Loomis Jr, and ed. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1 963) pg. 64, (Italics added).

must bear some of the marks of Gemeinschaft or Communitas. Such a symbol cannot be discovered in the mere fact that from time to time we are prompted to associate with one another around some shared interest. Nor can it be found, as Cicero would have it, in some "common agreement concerning what is right." The public must contain disagreement. An adequate symbol of public life must transcend mere interest.

The kind of thing that is wanted is perhaps best displayed in that panoply of symbols surrounding the Hebrew notion of "the people." When the Bar Mitsvah declares "I am a Jew," there is called forth the memory of a long history of belonging to a people or a public, and that public transcends differences of interest, geographic boundaries, and economic and political distinctions. But the important point about this illustration is that what constitutes the public, what evokes its consciousness in people, is not a shared interest or an agreement about what is good. It is a common memory transmitted through a set of shared symbols adequate to communicate that membership. And what is even more important, this conception of a public does not establish any solid division between what is public and what is private. Membership in a public in the Hebraic sense is not set over against membership in a family. It is in no way confined to political affairs or civic affairs, yet it leads to participation in the shared life of a people.

That is the kind of thing we see in the Hebrew notion of "the people." It suggests that what is required for the education of the public is some conception of the public and some way of communicating that conception so that the public is seen to extend back into the past and forward into the future. This is simply to say that one of the functions of educating the

public is to assist in forming a self-identity not only through participation in a contemporary community but also through memory of some historical community. This is one of the decisive points at which the social function of certification obfuscates the educational issues; for when it is the primary function of schools to sort and certify, they must be concerned with modernity above all else, and the necessity to form the kind of memory which establishes a person in some public is likely to go not only unrealized but even unrecognized.

There are, of course, alternative ways of understanding the idea of a public, approaches which rely less than the Hebrew view on the effects of a common history and shared mythology. Perhaps the most sustained and direct attack on the idea of the public is to be found in that most neglected of all Dewey's writings, The Public and Its Problems. There he set out directly to answer the question "What do we mean by the Public?" His answer rests neither upon the idea of a common interest, nor upon the idea of contract. Neither does he suggest that the existence of a public stems from the existence of a state or from the way the state is organized. He points out instead that among the transactions which occur among men there are some whose effects do not extend beyond the lives of those immediately engaged, but there are others whose consequences reach far beyond those immediately concerned. Here is the germ of the distinction between public and private. In the latter case, when the consequences of an act go far beyond those directly concerned then it takes on a public character, whether, as he puts it, "The conversation be carried on by a king and his prime minister or by Cataline and a fellow

conspirator or by merchants planning to monopolize a market." [2] A public then is constituted by all those who are in fact effected for good or ill by actions. Dewey says, "Those indirectly and seriously affected... form a group distinctive enough to deserve a name. The name selected is The Public."[3]

This view has several consequences. In the first place, it follows that the existence of a public is a question of fact. It is not something which needs forming as much as it simply needs recognizing. There are at least two ways in which a public may fail to be recognized. In the first place, it may fail in self-recognition. For example, those whose lives will be seriously affected by the location of a school may be unaware not only of how the decision will influence them, but of the fact that it may touch them at all. Hence they may remain an incohate public, lacking self-consciousness. They are, according to Dewey, a public, nonetheless, and potentially an articulate public. On the other hand, a public may fail to be recognized by those who are responsible for acting. Hence, the school authorities may fail to recognize who is touched by their actions or they may simply ignore them. This is a fairly accurate description of the relation between the public and school officials during the recent controversies in New York over the control of I. S. 201 and P. S. 36-125. What was for a long time an incohate public in Harlem has become what Dewey calls a concerned public. But the decisions of the school authorities often appear to be made without reference to that

---

2. John Dewey. The Public and Its Problems, (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1927), p. 13.
3. Ibid., p. 35

concerned public. Public decisions are then seen as removed from the public, as in no way expressive of the concerns of the effected public. In any case, the point is that a public is defined by the actual consequences of actions taken. A concerned public arises when people are aware of the consequences of those actions.

In the second place, Dewey's view implies that there are many publics. Presumably, there are as many publics as there are consequential issues calling for action. Here it should be observed that a public in Dewey's sense is not confined to people who have a common interest, or the same interest in some issues. A public contains people who have divergent or even conflicting interests. Hence, the public defined in many current school controversies such as those so publicized in New York City, includes not only parents and children, but teachers and other professionals, political representatives, business associates and many others who see their interests as divergent and who are differently persuaded. The fundamental political task is to bring into some comprehensive whole not only the diversity within each such public, but between various publics which may come into existence.

From within this framework of thought, there are important things that can be said about educating the public and education for public participation. To begin with, the existence of a public, is for Dewey a matter of fact and not a result of education. But what is often needed is the transformation of an incohate public into a concerned and articulate public. That does require education. One must learn how it is that decisions do touch one's life. If we were to introduce a distinction of Gilbert Ryle's between "knowing how" and "knowing that," between skills and information, then we can say that the

creation of a concerned public requires a great many kinds of "knowing that" -- knowing that such and such decisions are pending, that they are likely to have such and such consequences, they they are likely to be made by such and such persons or offices, that one has certain rights to information relevant to these decisions and so forth. But participation in a concerned public is also likely to require many kinds of knowing how-- knowing how to exercise one's rights, how to make information widely available, how to influence those in authority, how to conduct meetings, how to contact allies, and so forth. The point is that education of that kind of public for that kind of public is heavily laden with instruction in the exercise of skills. For preparation for citizenship it may become less important to be right and more important to be effective. It may be that the good man is not in demand if he be good for nothing. In short education of the public tends to more closely resemble technical education, civic action becomes tied to a kind of technical reason, and civic problems to technical problems.

It is impossible to stress too much how extensive a transformation these remarks imply for traditional American views of civic and moral education. Within Western moral theory, there have been three fundamental metaphores which have tended to guide our understanding of moral education. On the one hand, there has been the image of man the giver of law, the legislator. From that perspective the basic moral question has been "What is right?" That is the central question in the theory of duty. The second metaphore has been the image ofman as the searcher for and creator of value. From this point of view the crucial question is always, "What is the good for man?" This was the basic question which guided the utilitarians of the nineteenth century

to search for the underlying principle of value. It is also a strong element in Greek ethics. It is the view of moral theory which takes as fundamental the problem of value. The third guiding metaphore has been the image of man the artist, and from this view, the crucial question in the moral life is not what is right or what is good, but what is fitting. This is the central focus of the moral sense theorists and is a strong element in the Greek conception of hamartia, the notion that life is an art, that it requires the cultivation of techne or skill. These are quite distinct though related approaches to the topics of ethical theory.

The American experience, however, has been strongly influenced by the character of life in the New England town and on the frontier. The prevailing moral understanding has been strongly shaped by religious tradition and in particular _____ by Puritan influence with its strong focus on the theory of duty, and a corresponding rejection of a life based upon prudence alone. In short, the focus has, for the most part, been on what is right and good, and relatively less upon what is prudentially wise, effective, and efficient. But in the world of modern America, more highly organized, more urban, more technologically oriented, it may be precisely these later features which must count most heavily. In the setting of urban life, it can easily turn out that the most fundamental moral and civic question is no longer what is right or good but what is happening, what is happening to one's neighbor and to one's self and how, by what techne, something can be done about it. One's duties to neighbor may be unchanged, but the context in which they are discharged is greatly changed. They are more likely to be

referred to as the business of some institution, some agency, or some public body, such as the police, hospitals, schools, or churches. To discharge one's duties to neighbor in this sense becomes much more a matter of skill and efficiency. The moral agent becomes much more the public agent. He becomes a man with a particualr set of skills, the man who is able to "read the signs of the times," determine what is happening, what can be done about it and by what means, when action can be taken and when it cannot, and with what permanent and what temporary gains. This is a much stronger element of prudence, effectivemess and public involvement than Americans have been accustomed to associate with the conception of a moral agent. It is a view strongly reminisent of the traditional moral metaphore of man as an artist, but it would be better in the American context to view it as the model of man the technologist.

The problem is too difficult to deal with in detail within the limits of this essay, but one might hypothesize nonetheless, that it is precisely this transformation in the social context of civic and moral action which has made the concept of responsibility so important in the modern world. It is astonishing to note how little attention is paid to responsibility in the western tradition of moral thought. As far as I can determine, there are only two paragraphs in all of Aristotle's writings which deal with the idea, and those have to do with the problem of identifying the conditions for free choice. They do not deal with responsibility in the sense in which moderns understand it. As far as I am able to determine, the term itself, or its equivalent does not figure at all in any of the writings of classical moralists. One will search in vain for any treatment of the idea in the utilitarians of the nineteenth century. In Durkheim's lectures on moral education, in many respects the most mature expression of his thought, the idea of responsibility does not enter at all

as a fundamental category of moral conscience. The idea of duty is there, but that is not quite what is meant by the modern "ethic of responsibility." To the best of my knowledge the notion that "responsibility" might be placed along side the concepts of "right," "good" and "fitting" as a fundamental moral category is a distinctly twentieth century idea.

As far as I can determine, Richard Neibuhr's book, The Responsible Self is the first major work of moral theory to make the moral concept of responsibility more fundamental even than the ideas of the right, the good, and the fitting. He understands responsibility to be quite literally the ability to respond to what is happening in a public network of relations. His thought is based upon the ideas of George Herbert Mead, but the significance of his work is that he interprets moral behavior in the context of a public in the modern sense and sees the moral agent as possessing a certain kind of civic skill. He sees the responsible self as a kind of moral technologist, the possessor of a technical conscience, no different in kind, however, in his public and private life. The responsible self is able to respond to acts of love and intimacy and return them as well as he is able to respond to the acts of public officials on public questions. Neibuhr's conception of the responsible self is the conception of a man who lives and acts within a public in the sense in which Dewey intended, and yet it is not a view of moral agency which sets up any hard and fast dichotomy between the social skills required in public life and the capacity to respond in the intimacy of one's private associations.

Such an approach to the nature of civic education might provide a means of preserving the unity of the Hebrew view between public role and private life. It is heavily laden with the political connotations so central in

the classical view of the public. It also places a premium on the cultivation of the necessary social skills which are so functional a requirement for life in modern urban societies. But the sphere of intimacy is very limited in the urban setting, and the social skills essential for participation in the public may nonetheless be exercised in relation to a narrowly circumscribed image of who is one's neighbor. What is at the same time crucial and also ommited from these suggestions is any means of representing and communicating in the process of education the kind of social commitment which transcends temporary interests and is the basis for a social concern that extends beyond one's immediate public in Dewey's sense. In short, the education of a public requires an image of the solidarity of men in a public sufficient to evoke a social commitment of the suburbanite in the solution of the problems in the city, and a social commitment of the rich to the poor, of the religiously diverse to the service of those who do not share their peculiar history or their uniquely defined community. What is demanded for the modern education of the public is a symbol of the social commitment so necessary in our day, a vivid image of how it is that we are united in spite of all divisions, a conception of the public which bears the marks of communitas in the midst of urban technological society but which at the same time does not involve us in the nostalgic return to the small, spacially limited community of New England or the frontier.

It does not seem to me in any sense obvious that this goal is attainable in a society whose schools are structurally and culturally devoted to the task of selecting, certifying and sorting. The social skills essential for participation in the public might well be strengthened in such a system

of schools, because such schools, place a premium on the capacity of the student to learn to take the long view and to manipulate the school establishment so as to get the "proper certification." But it is extremely doubtful, in my mind at least, that such a school system can properly turn its attention to assist young people in interpreting their lives, and to vividly transmit the necessary civic mythology essential for the formation of a public. If there is some tension between certification and citizenship as the fundamental function of education it must be most poignantly evident in the struggles of young and old alike to meaningfully interpret their lives and their place with others in some kind of public. In this sense, the most fundamental problem of modern education is anthropological in the classic sense.